DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 026

7 February 1983

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Reagan Message 'to Peoples of Europe' Viewed AA 1
'Political Game' [Korionov in PRAVDA 6 Feb] AA 1
'Nothing New' [Losev] AA 2
PRAVDA: Zero Option 'Unrealistic, Unacceptable' AA 3
[Editorial Article, 7 Feb]
U.S. Threat to Mediterranean Security Seen AA 4
[Kovalev in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Feb]
U.S. Trident Nuclear Submarine Plans Noted AA 6
APN Interviews USSR's Geneva Delegation Leader AA 7
[Prague LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE 3 Feb]
TASS Observer Views Arms Talks in Geneva AA 8
[Bogachov in Sofia ZEMDELSKO ZNAME 2 Feb]
Paper Assails U.S. Approach to Geneva Talks AA 9
[Semeyko in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Jan]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Meeting of Socialist Radio, TV Leaders Held BB 1
Talks With Chernenko BB 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Bovin, Shishlin, Levin]
Bush's West Europe Visit CC 1
FRG Elections CC 3
Economic Problems CC 6

BUSH TRIP TO WEST EUROPE

Bush Activities in Geneva Subject of Comment DD 1
Speaks to Disarmament Committee [Dragunov] DD 1
Asserts U.S. 'Moral Position' [Dmitriyev] DD 1
'Leak' on Arms Control Initiative DD 2
[Manakov in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 26 Jan]
Meets With Soviet Delegates DD 3
Talks With U.S. Representatives DD 3
Commentary Continues on Purpose of Visit DD 3
Reagan's Open Letter Assessed [Kondrashov] DD 3
Europe's 'Skeptical' Reaction [Bovin] DD 5
Soviet Stand Misrepresented [Shlenov] DD 6
Discussions With Italian Leaders Previewed DD 7
One of 'Most Reliable' Allies [Aleksandrova] DD 7
'Special Place' on Itinerary [Prostakov] DD 7

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reagan 'Juggling', 'Twisting' Economic Statistics A 1
TASS Reports Reagan Radio Address on Economy A 1
[Lyutiy]
Dislikes Term 'Reaganomics' [Lyutiy] A 2
TASS: Voice of America Head Launches New Purge A 3

CHINA

Shultz Wraps Up China Leg of Far East Tour B 1
Talks End [Kaverznev] B 1
Reagan Invitation Issued B 1
Meeting With Sihanouk [Kaverznev] B 1
Problems Remain [Bovin] B 2
PRC Daily Warns U.S. About Korean 'Provocations' B 3

NORTHEAST ASIA

Reportage on Shultz Visit to South Korea C 1
Arrives Amid 'Growth of Tension' C 1
Commitment to S. Korea C 1
Shultz on Team Spirit-83 C 1

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Military Delegation Visits Moscow D 1
Arrival 4 Feb D 1
Ustinov, Qader Meeting D 1
Radio Defends Soviet Position on Afghanistan D 1
[Mitin]
U.S. Aid to 'Afghan Counterrevolution' Viewed D 2
[Biryukov]
DRA Troops Rout 'Counterrevolutionaries' D 5
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Reviews Situation in Afghanistan D 5
[Vinogradov, 3 Feb]
Formation of DRA Volunteer Corps Reported D 7
Dymshits Attends Meeting To Mark Indian Holiday D 7
[PRAVDA 26 Jan]

WESTERN EUROPE

West European Reaction to Reagan Letter Noted G 1
[Kaverznev]
Austrian Chancellor in United States for Talks G 2
'A Time of Aggravation' [Pakhomov] G 2
Kreisky Remarks Cited [Lutiy] G 3
IZVESTIYA 'Rejoinder' Criticizes Austrian Radio G 4
AUCCTU Delegation Ends Talks in France G 4
French President Receives New Soviet Ambassador G 5
Portuguese Government, U.S. To Negotiate on Bases G 5

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Commentator Interviews Egyptian Politicians H 1
[Belyaye in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 19 Jan]
Peace & Progress Comments on Corruption in Egypt H 6
[Al-Masri]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Zambian, UN Leaders on Namibia, Other Issues J 1
CIA Seen Behind 'Subversion' Against Ghana J 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 2 Feb]
Additional Reportage J 2
Meeting Marks Anniversary of Ghanaian-USSR Ties J 3
[Tarasov in PRAVDA 19 Jan]
Cuban CP Member in Ethiopia for COPWE Talks J 3

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

U.S. Involvement in El Salvador Assessed K 1
'Interventionist Schemes' Revealed K 1
Vietnam Parallels Drawn [Baryshev] K 1
'Adviser' Injured, Officers Withdrawn K 1
U.S. Accused of Biological War Against Cuba K 2
Arkhipov Receives Cuba's Rodriguez, Capote K 2
[IZVESTIYA 3 Feb]
Castro Replies to USSR Congratulations K 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Shevardnadze Addresses Tbilisi Party Aktiv R 1
Demichev, Shauro Attend Cultural Soiree R 1
USSR Citizens Cited on Overseas Visits R 1
[Sotnik in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 23 Jan]
IZVESTIYA Views Wasted, Substandard Bread R 1
[Sukhachevskiy, 21 Jan]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Cosmos-1439 Earth Satellite Launched 6 Feb U 1
Space Mission Planned To Study Comet, Venus U 1
[Kuznetsova]

REAGAN MESSAGE 'TO PEOPLES OF EUROPE' REVIEWED

'Political Game'

PM062203 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Feb 83 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Political Observer's Notes": "Both Deception and Confrontation"]

[Text] These are troubled times for top representatives of the Washington administration. Resistance to the dangerous schemes of the aggressive adventurist U.S. circles is mounting everywhere. The antiwar, antimissile movement in West Europe, in the United States itself and in other parts of the world is gathering strength. Of course, Washington cannot fail to see that more and more millions of people everywhere are reaching the conclusion that the Soviet Union's recent important peace initiatives and also the Warsaw Pact states' constructive proposals have created a real opportunity to place on a practical footing the resolution of one of the most burning questions of our time -- the reaching of agreement at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. The public is demanding increasingly persistently: Full use must be made of the opportunity that has been created.

But this does not fit in with the plans of those who determine the Washington administration's policy. However, it is also impossible for them to disclose their true schemes in the present atmosphere of the peoples' universal desire for peace. Hence the new ruses pursuing the aim of "killing two birds with one stone": slandering the USSR's peace-loving course while presenting in a favorable light the U.S. course, which is blocking the solution of extremely acute international problems.

President R. Reagan's message "to the peoples of Europe" is a graphic illustration of this political game. Cases where a message from the head of a major state immediately meets with a negative assessment almost everywhere are not encountered all that often in international life. The Hague correspondent for THE NEW YORK TIMES reported: The appeal "is being called sheer propaganda in West Europe and is regarded as a tactical ploy directed against European public opinion on the question of missile deployment." West Germany's STUTTGARTER ZEITUNG writes: "Informed circles think it is unlikely that the American side is really ready for a Soviet-American summit." And Britain's THE GUARDIAN stated: The appeal "has not reassured but alarmed West Europeans, whose doubts as to the truth of the American Administration's statements of intent to conclude an agreement with the Soviet Union have intensified."

But the more alarm this course evokes in West Europe, the more stubbornly official Washington representatives try to camouflage its real essence. A further illustration of this was U.S. Vice Presdient G. Bush's speech in West Berlin at the start of his marathon tour of West Europe. The visitor laid it on thick and did not spare his vocal chords either. He solemnly vowed: "We too are in favor of peace.... We too are opposed to nuclear war."

But how to prove the unprovable? So commonplace deception, premised on his audience's history being a bit rusty, was brought into play. The vice president claimed that "for a decade the United States on its own initiative effectively froze nuclear armaments."

But what is the reality? Here are just a few facts. By 1966-1967 the United States had reached the present level of strategic arms in terms of the quantity of delivery vehicles and had achieved, with some to spare, the maximum saturation of its armed forces with missiles. But in the seventies the Pentagon showed no signs of "restraint." At that time the U.S. Armed Forces received an average of three new nuclear charges every day. While in 1960 U.S. strategic weapons could deliver to targets a little over 2,000 nuclear charges, by the early eighties the figure was over 15,000. And what about the MX missile -- a first-strike weapon? And the Trident II missile? And neutron, chemical and space weapons? And was the renewal of the American forward-based facilities, which perform the role of strategic weapons in relation to the USSR while using medium-range weapons, not proceeding in parallel with this?

Referring to medium-range facilities, the vice president went so far as to claim: "NATO has no analogous weapons systems." What then has become of, say, the systems of that kind possessed by Britain and by another NATO member -- France? Britain's THE TIMES wrote just a few days ago that the British medium-range nuclear weapons "are integrated within NATO and are targeted in the light of the targets within range of the U.S. deterrent forces."

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the American Administration's aim does not boil down simply to foisting the lethal Pershings and Tomahawks on West Europe at all costs. G. Bush assures people that the USSR, or so he claims, is trying to "drive a wedge between the United States and its European allies."

Yet another piece of deception: Does the treaty proposed by the Warsaw Pact members to the NATO states on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace envisage nonparticipation by the United States in such a treaty? After all, without U.S. participation such a treaty would be totally meaningless.

For decades the USSR and the other socialist community countries have been seeking to ensure that all European states, and also other participants in the Helsinki process act together, in a united front, in the name of asserting in Europe and therefore throughout the world relations of peaceful coexistence and all-around cooperation.

By contrast -- and this is confirmed with new force by the Reagan administration's recent actions -- Washington's line is to sow relations of mistrust, suspicion and enmity between European countries. Perhaps in such troubled waters the trans-Atlantic "fisherman" will be able to catch the "fish" he needs -- to deceive the peoples and at the same time to kindle confrontation between them.

'Nothing New'

LD041148 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 3 Feb 83

[Text] The Soviet Union is for an agreement with the United States on the issue of intermediate nuclear arms in Europe. In its opinion such an agreement should provide for the full equality of the two sides, that is the Soviet Union and NATO, in both missiles and aircraft. But the two sides should be equal at a dramatically reduced level. This is how the Soviet stand was described by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party Yuriy Andropov in his interview with the national daily PRAVDA on Tuesday. Here now is a commentary from Sergey Losev:

In his interview for PRAVDA the Soviet leader made it abundantly clear that this country is prepared to sign an agreement based on equality. He also raised the following question: Is the American President prepared to sign such an agreement based on the principles of equality and equal security? Regrettably, Washington's stand on the issue does not invite confidence. President Reagan's letter to the peoples of Europe read out in West Berlin by Vice President Bush contains nothing new. It amounts to the same zero option plan which is obviously unacceptable for the Soviet Union because it provides for the unilateral disarmament of this country. This, by the way, was noted by all international news agencies.

The FRANCE PRESSE news agency says, quoting diplomatic observers in Washington, that Mr Reagan's letter adds nothing new to his administration's previous zero option proposal. The BBC has also said that Mr Reagan's proposal contains nothing new and described it as a confirmation of President Reagan's commitment to the zero option plans. The NBC television company holds the same view. It said bluntly that all this is propaganda aimed at winning support for the United States on the issue of missiles from European public opinion. The unrealistic stand taken by the United States has deadlocked the Geneva talks. The fact that the U.S. President has reaffirmed his administration's stand indicates that the United States is not willing to seek a mutually acceptable agreement with the Soviet Union and therefore deliberately dooms the Geneva talks to failure.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union for its part has proposed various ways to reduce nuclear arms in Europe on the basis of strict compliance with the principle of equality and equal security. In the opinion of the Soviet Union all nuclear arms, both intermediate and tactical, can be removed from Europe in what would be a genuine zero option, but since the United States will not accept that, the Soviet Union is prepared to accept a formula under which it would retain as many missiles as are deployed on NATO's side at the moment. But it proposes that at the same time an agreement be reached to reduce and equalize the number of intermediate nuclear capable aircraft deployed by the two sides.

In his interview with PRAVDA the Soviet leader reaffirmed this proposal. "With regard to the idea of holding a Soviet-American summit meeting one should bear in mind that this proposal was first advanced by the Soviet Union. In April of last year the Soviet leadership called for holding a summit but this proposal was rejected by the Reagan administration. On the eve of the new year the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party Yuriy Andropov noted once again in an interview with the American political observer Mr Kingsbury-Smith that the Soviet leadership always thought of summit contacts as an effective way of promoting relations between nations. The Soviet leadership holds this view now and Yuriy Andropov made this clear in his PRAVDA interview.

At the same time the Soviet leader called attention to the obviously irresponsible stand taken on the issue by Washington. Yuriy Andropov said that the U.S. President links the issue of holding a summit with his obviously unacceptable formula for a solution of the problem of nuclear arms in Europe and this does not indicate at all that the U.S. Administration approaches the issue seriously. This is a regrettable fact.

PRAVDA: ZERO OPTION 'UNREALISTIC, UNACCEPTABLE'

LD061841 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Feb 83 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed editorial article: "At Odds With the Facts]

[Text] Hardly anyone now doubts that the American position regarding the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe and their so-called "zero option" is groundless. Indeed, Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pointed out, can one talk in earnest about a proposal under which the Soviet Union would be obliged unilaterally to destroy all its medium-range missiles while the United States and its NATO allies would retain all nuclear means of this category which are at their disposal?

Even many people in the capitals of NATO's Western Europe member-states feel more and more uncomfortable with the American "zero." The allies are prompting Washington, albeit under their breath, that it might just about be time to start thinking about something else.

It is about time, too. However, the United States stubbornly remains committed to its completely unrealistic, unacceptable position. Naturally enough, it is not possible to justify it or reinforce it. One knows, after all, in advance that one is dealing with rotten goods. They are making use of the usual method of working backward [metod ot obratnogo]: They are doing everything to try to cast aspersions on the Soviet position and are none too choosy about their means. Here we have both lies and unfair shuffling and passing things over in silence.

Recently, for example, U.S. Vice President Bush tried once again to prove that the balance of nuclear forces in Europe has been tipped in favor of the Soviet Union. How can there have been a balance several years ago before the new Soviet medium-range missiles came on the scene, he exclaimed pathetically, and it still be maintained now that they are here? At the same time he claimed that the West has no such facilities at all, apparently.

Here we have, as they say, a composite approach: a combination of telling lies and saying nothing. In Washington they know perfectly well, but Mr Bush preferred to keep silent about the fact, that the Soviet Union has not built up the quantity of its medium-range weapons in Europe but has merely been modernizing them. Whenever a new missile was deployed, one or two old missiles were withdrawan and scrapped. Moreover, the Soviet Union continued to withdraw such missiles even after it unilaterally ceased to deploy new medium-range missiles in its European part. Those are the facts. And it is also a fact that on the NATO side in Europe there are hundreds of medium-range nuclear weapons, including missiles.

In other words, there has been an approximate balance of forces in Europe in medium-range nuclear weapons and it is still maintained. But this is the very thing which is not to Washington's liking. Hence its obstructionist position at the talks, deliberately dooming them to failure, and its aspiration to deploy the new U.S. nuclear missiles in West Europe at any cost. And this can not be concealed by any propagandistic contrivance.

However, it must be clear that the USSR will not undertake unilateral disarmament, and that it will respond in a suitable manner to the deployment of the U.S. missiles, should this occur. But the Soviet Union is resolutely for a different path: for a radical reduction of the level of nuclear confrontation [protivostoyaniye] and for strengthening European security. The Soviet proposals -- to reduce by several times the quantity of medium-range nuclear weapons, and in such a way that the USSR and NATO should be left with an equal number of both missiles and aircraft -- is on the negotiations table. The United States must give a reply to whether it is prepared to make such a truly just agreement.

U.S. THREAT TO MEDITERRANEAN SECURITY SEEN

PM041701 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Feb 83 First Edition p 1

[Eduard Kovalev "International Review": "Security for the Mediterranean"]

[Text] The Mediterranean is a most important region of the world from every viewpoint: political, economic, military, cultural. From time immemorial it was the cradle of human civilization and one of its most ancient seats. The Mediterranean Sea, which washes the shores of three continents -- Europe, Asia and Africa -- has long served as a major international transport artery. Rich energy resources and stocks of raw materials, including strategic raw materials, are concentrated there.

At present, unfortunately, it is a region where there are frequently serious conflicts and acute crises which are a threat to peace in Europe and throughout the world. If the aggressive nature of U.S. and NATO foreign policy and military-strategic actions increases, the Mediterranean could become one of the most explosive weapon stockpiles on the globe. In these conditions its problems become particularly important and urgent.

American statesmen make no secret of the fact that they regard the region as a zone of U.S. "vital interests." The United States seeks to establish an unchecked right to domination there through brute force and military might. But for all the significance of economic factors, political and military-strategic considerations have the central place in U.S. plans. An extensive military presence in the region gives the Pentagon the opportunity to create a powerful "bridgehead," a base on the approaches to the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and to the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, tropical Africa and ultimately the Indian Ocean. Not for nothing is there constant talk of extending NATO's "sphere of operation" through the Mediterranean regions to other neighboring regions.

In the opinion of Pentagon strategists and the North Atlantic bloc headquarters, U.S. and NATO domination of the Mediterranean makes it possible to exert pressure, to the West's advantage, on neutral and nonaligned states in the region, to preserve the political and social status quo in states which have found themselves within imperialism's military-political system, and if necessary to interfere in the internal affairs of countries in southern Europe so as to prevent shifts to the left.

NATO strategists, stepping up militarist preparations, regard the Mediterranean as the main link in NATO's southern European theater of military operations. According to Western press reports, more than 1.1 million servicemen are concentrated there. They are assigned a special role in the event of an "emergency" situation in the Mediterranean countries. The main U.S. aggressive force in the region is also permanently deployed there -- the American 6th Fleet: Its ships were brought into the Mediterranean back in the days of World War II, and stayed, despite promises to withdraw them.

In deploying major American naval forces in the Mediterranean the United States counted on "locking" the Soviet Union in the Black Sea while itself perpetrating arbitrary acts without hindrance. It has repeatedly displayed American "military muscle" there. Suffice it to mention the 6th Fleet operations during the 1956 Suez crisis, the events in Lebanon in 1958, the so-called "assistance" to Israel in 1967 and 1973, and lastly its action last year during the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

These continuing intrigues by the imperialists have given rise to the need for the presence of Soviet warships in the Mediterranean. But it should be noted that they are not there to create a threat to any people or state. Their task is to promote stability in the Mediterranean region. And Soviet warships have never participated in any military operations there.

Let us recall that back in 1962 the United States introduced into the Mediterranean, for combat patrol, missile-carrying nuclear submarines which form part of the American command's strategic offensive systems. Aircraft carrying nuclear weapons are deployed at American bases in Mediterranean NATO countries and on an aircraft carriers of the 6th Fleet.

One of the most dangerous centers of nuclear threat could soon be Comiso in southern Sicily -- the place chosen by the Italian Government for building another NATO missile base. It is to be equipped with new American nuclear weapons. Reports appeared in the Italian press recently on the Italian Government's readiness to deploy in Sicily not only 112 cruise missiles but also Pershing II's, which had not been in question before.

This is undoubtedly a dangerous step which will put a completely different face on the state of affairs in the region. First, it will jeopardize the population of Sicily itself and the neighboring regions. After all, in the event of aggression against the socialist countries, regardless of where the first NATO nuclear slavo is launched from, the conflict, once started, will engulf all the bloc's missile sites in nuclear conflagration. Second, the flight path of, for instance, cruise missiles targeted on NATO's "potential enemy" will inevitably cross the airspace of a number of Mediterranean and Balkan states. And that will not only violate their sovereignty, it will create a direct threat to their national security and thus to peace in the region. Third, the appearance of nuclear missiles at Comiso gives rise to a new situation for the European countries of the Mediterranean.

Moreover the strengthening of the U.S. and NATO nuclear missile potential resulting from the appearance of the Comiso base will give additional impetus to the arms race in the region and complicate the prospects for demilitarization of the Mediterranean.

Last, the creation of the Comiso base, by changing the military-strategic situation in the region, will step up the nuclear threat not only for the adjacent states of the Mediterranean and the Balkans, but for the countries of North Africa and the Near East, since they will be within range of the American medium-range missiles. Moreover, the missiles could become an instrument of nuclear blackmail against them.

As for the Soviet Union, it consistently upholds the idea of creating peace zones in various parts of the world, including the Mediterranean. We also support the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans. As long ago as summer 1981 the Soviet Union, seeking to change the Mediterranean from an arena of military-political confrontations into a zone of stable peace and cooperation, put forward a number of proposals aimed at extending to the Mediterranean region the confidence-building measures in the military sphere which have already proved their worth in international practice; at a coordinated reduction in armed forces in the region; at the withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons from the Mediterranean; at the renunciation of the deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of nonnuclear Mediterranean countries; and last, at the adoption by the nuclear powers of a commitment not to use nuclear weapons against any Mediterranean country which does not permit the deployment of such weapons on its own territory.

These peace proposals were again confirmed and developed in January of this year, at the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference in Prague. In view of the increase in the role of navies, the participants in the Prague conference called for talks to begin on limiting naval activity, limiting and reducing naval armaments and extending confidence-building measures to sea and ocean areas. This applies accordingly to the Mediterranean too.

In general the Soviet Union advocates a different path from the United States for resolving arms problems in Europe. This was stated by Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, answering a PRAVDA correspondent's questions. "The best thing of all," he stressed," -- and we propose this -- is not to have either medium-range of tactical nuclear weapons in the European zone at all. Since the United States does not accept that, we are prepared for a solution whereby the Soviet Union would have no more missiles than are already in Europe on the NATO side."

Mention must be made of the positive role of the progressive international public in the region, representing the most varied political circles. The latest example -- the "no to nuclear weapons in Portugal" movement has put forward an initiative on creating a nuclear-free zone on the Iberian Peninsula. At a meeting held in Lisbon the other day, a decision was adopted to appeal to Spanish peace fighters to launch a joint campaign against nuclear weapons with a view to banning forever the deployment in or transportation across the territory of Portugal and Spain of any type of nuclear weapons.

The peace aspirations of the Mediterranean peoples and their determination to rebuff the imperialists and their accomplices are gaining strength. In achieving these noble goals they can count on the assistance of the Soviet people and the peoples of Europe's socialist countries, who are well aware that the elimination of local hotbeds of war and international tension is a necessary condition leading to the strengthening of world peace.

U.S. TRIDENT NUCLEAR SUBMARINE PLANS NOTED

LD070954 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 7 Feb 83

[Text] According to the Pentagon's new directives, 20 Trident nuclear submarines will join the U.S. Navy in the coming decade. Each of them is armed with 24 intercontinental nuclear ballistic missiles. This is five submarines more than were envisaged 2 years ago in the framework of a program of unprecedented increases in the U.S. strategic arsenal. As THE NEW YORK TIMES points out, the implementation of the Trident program will require astronomical allocations of $42.5 billion in the next 15 years.

APN INTERVIEWS USSR'S GENEVA DELEGATION LEADER

AU041314 Prague LIDOVA DEMOKRACIE in Czech 3 Feb 83 p 2

[Report on interview given by Viktor Izraelyan, head of USSR delegation to the Geneva Disarmament Committee, to APN's correspondent in Geneva, V. Shishkovskiy: "The Disarmament Committee's Session" -- date and place of interview not given]

[Text] The Disarmament Committee yesterday reopened its work in the Palace of Nations in Geneva. What main problems are standing on the agenda of its regular session? This is the question put by V. Shishkovskiy, APN's correspondent in Geneva, to Viktor Izraelyan, head of the Soviet delegation there.

"The Disarmament Committee is entering the third decade of its existence. It must be said that, in the past, it accomplished a lot that was beneficial for limiting feverish armament and for disarmament. For instance, such important international agreements as the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons; the convention banning the development, production, and accumulation of bacteriological, biological, and toxic weapons and on their destruction; and the treaty banning the deployment of nuclear weapons and other kinds of mass destruction weapons on sea and ocean beds were all prepared within the framework of this committee.

"But in the last few years," the head of the Soviet delegation stressed, "the committee has been treading water and its work clearly stagnating. This is also confirmed by the fact that its members did not succeed in preparing even one single agreement in the sphere of limiting feverish armament; and there is a reason for this. It lies in the unwillingness of the United States and of a number of its NATO allies to conclude agreements in the disarmament sphere. The obstructionist attitude adopted by the United States at the Soviet-American negotiations that are also taking place here, in Geneva, on limiting nuclear arms in Europe and also on limiting and reducing strategic weapons is no different from that maintained by the American representatives in the Disarmament Committee. The current session is starting under the conditions of an extremely aggravated international situation, when the war preparations of the United States and the NATO bloc have achieved record dimensions. The concept of conducting a "limited," or "drawn-out," or some other brand of nuclear war is being propagated in the West. New kinds of weapons, including those of mass destruction, are being designed and put into production. Under these conditions it seems to me that the significance and role of the Disarmament Committee are rather great."

Viktor Izraelyan recalled that this is particularly cited in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact member-states. As we know the socialist countries stressed in this document, the urgent need to speed up the preparation of agreements on a number of specific issues. They appeal to all states to provide a new impulse for negotiations, including those taking place within the framework of the Geneva Disarmament Committee. Within a certain time, the committee could work out a treaty on the complete and total ban of all nuclear arms tests; speed up the preparation of an international accord on the ban and liquidation of chemical weapons; and go over to working on the accord banning neutron weapons. Apart from that, it is imperative to open immediate negotiations on the ban on deploying any kind of weapon in space, to speedily conclude negotiating the international accord banning radiological weapons, and finally to speed up the decision on the issue of strengthening security guarantees to non-nuclear countries."

"As you see, the tasks are important and considerable," V. Izraelyan then continued. "I can say that the Soviet delegation and the delegations of socialist countries are adopting a constructive stand on all these issues; this will make it possible to achieve satisfactory agreements in the near future -- naturally, provided that the Western side is also prepared for this.

In conclusion, I want to express my firm conviction that the new, significant foreign-political initiatives formulated in the speeches of Yu.V. Andropov, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and in the Political Declaration of the Warsaw Pact's member-states, will undoubtedly stand in the center of attention at the current session of the Disarmament Committee in Geneva."

TASS OBSERVER VIEWS ARMS TALKS IN GENEVA

AU031530 Sofia ZEMDELSKO ZNAME in Bulgarian 2 Feb 83 pp 1-4

[Article by Vladimir Bogachov, TASS military affairs observer: "The Preservation of Equality Is the Only Possible Basis for Mutually Acceptable Agreements" -- "Soviet-American Negotiations on the Limitation and Reduction of Strategic Arms Resume in Geneva Today" -- dispatched from Moscow for ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Feb -- The high-ranking representatives of the Warsaw Pact member-countries, who met at the Prague summit of the Political Consultative Committee, pointed out the great importance of the successful development of Soviet-U.S. negotiations on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms.

Strategic arms, such as the ICBM installed on nuclear submarines and heavy bombers, have the largest megatonnage of all types of nuclear systems and are capable of causing the greatest destruction if they are used.

At the Geneva Soviet-U.S. negotiations which are being resumed on 2 February 1983, the two sides are coming with clearly defined positions. The U.S. approach to the solution of the questions of principle on the limitation of strategic arms, for example, was clarified long before 29 June 1982 when the present talks began.

Rejecting the Soviet-American SALT II treaty, which envisaged a considerable reduction of strategic weapons on both sides to an equal level, refusing to accept the proposals on freezing nuclear arsenals, the Reagan Administration demonstrated that it would be satisfied only with a solution in this field -- the intensification of the arms race in the vain hope that it will lead to military superiority over the USSR.

After 1981 Washington began to wage a noisy campaign about the "USSR's superiority in the field of military technical equipment, including strategic weapons." It is a well-known fact that an approximate balance exists between the USSR and the United States as regards strategic weapons, and this was confirmed by the coordinated addenda to the SALT II treaty, containing carefully checked figures and data in this respect. It is also a well-known fact that in recent years the USSR has adopted no measures whatsoever likely to produce disruption in the existing equality of strategic forces.

It is characteristic of the official U.S. representatives that in their public statements they have never dared to cast any doubt on the authenticity of the figures contained in the SALT II addenda. Washington just considers it more convenient to ignore this important document.

Using absolutely false unconfirmed assertions about the "superiority of the Soviet Union in the sector of strategic arms" official Washington is trying to justify its policy of unrestrained increase in the U.S. nuclear potential.

The first proposals submitted by the United States at the negotiations create the impression that Washington is solely guided by its propaganda goals, based on deceiving public opinion as regards genuine U.S. intentions in the field of strategic arms.

U.S. propaganda is eagerly advertising the most recent U.S. proposals as being the "most just and creative ones."

Washington representatives are pointing to the fact that to accept the U.S. plan would mean to reduce the number of missiles on both sides by 50 percent to an equal level, while the number of warheads on ICBM and ballistic missiles on nuclear submarines should be reduced by one-third.

In fact, the equality mentioned by the U.S. representatives is not felt at all. Washington is actually proposing to the USSR that it place the Soviet strategic forces within a framework drafted to suit the U.S. strategic forces. The American side is trying to obtain one-sided advantages for itself from the structural differences existing in the strategic forces of both countries, proposing that a special limit be set on the number of warheads on land-based ICBM. The coordination of this limit on the number of warheads with the "ceiling" on land-based carriers would produce a 90-percent reduction of Soviet ICBM's, which now represent the basic force of the USSR strategic forces.

Should the U.S. proposals be implemented, a basic reorganization of the USSR strategic forces should be made. On the other hand, the U.S. plan would not affect the U.S. program for the deployment of MX missiles, of "Trident-2" naval missiles and of "B-1" bombers.

According to the U.S. proposals, the American strategic Air Force carrying more than 40 percent of the nuclear megatonnage of U.S. strategic forces by no means affects any limitations or reductions at the first stage. As is known, the United States has a fourfold superiority over the USSR in heavy bombers.

If U.S. proposals on the composition of American strategic forces were to be accepted, the American strategic forces, for example, would have 1,400 carriers, while the USSR would have one and a half times fewer that number. As to the number of nuclear warheads, these U.S. carriers would outnumber the Soviet ones almost three times. Such an agreement, granting one-sided superiority to the United States, cannot be accepted by the USSR.

On the other hand, the USSR proposals envisage an essential, complex reduction by 25 percent of all three components of the strategic "triad" on both sides -- including heavy bombers -- to an equal level, as well as a ban on the production of new types of strategic weapons. In addition, the USSR proposes that during the period of negotiations the quantity of strategic weapons be frozen and their modernization optimally limited.

It is very important that as the Soviet Union proposes, the limitation on and reduction of both the USSR and the United States remain at equal levels at all stages and that the balance remain unchanged.

The U.S. proposals reveal the intentions of the Reagan administration to maintain the present state of stagnation at the current Geneva negotiations. Balance, equality, and equal security -- this is the only possible basis on which agreements on the questions of strategic weapons can and should be based. This is precisely the method proposed by the Soviet Union.

PAPER ASSAILS U.S. APPROACH TO GENEVA TALKS

PM040941 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Jan 83 Second Edition p 1

[Lev Semeyko "International Review": "Dialogue in Geneva"]

[Text] Our ideal is universal peace. Lasting, reliable, and stable peace. That is the paramount and most urgent demand of all people and all the peoples. If the vast stocks of nuclear weapons are not to undermine mankind's home, they must be radically reduced and subsequently eliminated. So long as they do exist everything must be done so as not to create a precedent [as published] for their being launched.

It is at resolving this fundamental task that the USSR's solemn commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons is aimed. The Warsaw Pact countries' proposal to conclude a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations between the members of the two military-political groupings -- the Warsaw Pact and NATO -- is also aimed at resolving that task.

The reciprocal commitment of the participants in the two alliances not to be first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against each other must be the core of such a treaty. The proposal to disband both alliances with the removal of their external organizations as a first step remains in force.

The latest round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe opens in Geneva today. The beginning of the latest round of Strategic Arms Limitation and Reduction Talks [START] is also scheduled for early February. During the recess in the dialogue the sides have been assessing their positions and must now compare them to find a way out of the deadlock in which the talks find themselves through Washington's fault.

The USSR's approach to lowering the level of nuclear confrontation both in Europe and between the USSR and the United States is based on a single principle -- equality and identical security. The Soviet Union is prepared for a radical limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons which at the same time would not lead to unilateral military advantages. This is the main point.

Let us take "Eurostrategic" missiles. The new Soviet initiative put forward at the end of last December by Comrade Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, provides a way out of the impasse. It proceeds from a realistic consideration of the situation related to the fact that the United States rejects a genuine "zero" option -- to completely eliminate medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. The USSR has proposed another alternative: that the USSR and the NATO countries reduce their medium-range arms by more than two-thirds, but the United States has not even gone that far to date. Now the Soviet Union is declaring its readiness to preserve in Europe as many missiles as Britain and France possess. To implement this alternative the USSR would dismantle hundreds of missiles including several dozen of the most modern SS-20s, as they are called in the West. That would really be an honest "zero" option at the USSR-U.S. level. At the same time, equality in Europe would be ensured in terms of medium-range missiles at the USSR-NATO level. Such a level could also be subsequently reduced if London and Paris agreed. At the same time, agreement must also be reached on the reduction to equal levels on both sides of the number of medium-range carrier aircraft stationed in Europe by the USSR and the NATO countries. A separate [razdelnyy] approach to the reduction of missiles and aircraft creates new opportunities for implementing the principle of equality and identical security. The USSR has taken a major step toward reaching agreement -- and this is widely recognized by many Western statesmen and public figures.

However, judging from recent utterances by the Reagan administration, Washington continues to cling to the notorious "zero" option whose implementation would ensure U.S. and NATO superiority in the nuclear sphere. And it is doing so deliberately. By all accounts, the U.S. side intends to prolong the talks to the utmost, to blame the Soviet Union for that and to deploy the Pentagon's new nuclear missile arsenal in Europe come what may. Washington has already been blocking the talks for over 1 year now by this approach. It cannot be a basis for reaching agreement since it would seriously infringe the interests of the security of the USSR and its allies. It would be most unrealistic to believe that our country would agree to dismantle all its medium-range missiles without the United States and its nuclear allies parting with a single aircraft or missile. And that is the essence of the U.S.-style "zero" option. A START agreement would be of truly inestimable significance for preventing nuclear catastrophe and for curtailing the strategic arms race. The past two rounds of talks on this problem failed to produce a positive result.

Again through the fault of the United States which is pursuing the aim of gaining unilateral advantages not only by means of the strategic arms race but also by means of the talks. This is demonstrated by the U.S. stance to which Washington's representatives have hitherto adhered in Geneva.

In fact, if the entire package of U.S. proposals were adopted, our country would have to dismantle over 90 percent of its ICBM's. That would undermine the basis of our strategic defense might. At the same time, the United States could even increase its potential for delivering a first incapacitating strike which would undermine strategic stability and intensify the threat of unleashing a nuclear conflict. Such a stance by Washington does not contain the kind of foundation which could serve as a basis for seeking agreement.

The USSR's proposals provide such a basis. The issue here is the stage-by-stage reduction by 1990 of the total quantity of ICBM launchers and ballastic missiles mounted on submarines and heavy bombers to 1,800 units per side. That means that our country is ready to reduce its strategic arms by over 25 percent. U.S. arms must also be reduced accordingly which would ensure an equal and substantially smaller number of strategic weapons carriers for both states. All possible channels for a strategic arms race would be blocked. As Yu. V. Andropov stated recently, this would merely be the beginning: Agreement on the basis indicated would be the departure point for an even greater mutual strategic arms reduction in light of the general strategic situation in the world. While talks are in progress the sides' strategic arsenals must be frozen. This is a position ensuring not only equality and identical security but also more favorable conditions for conducting the talks.

However, the United States is doing its utmost to distort the essence of the Soviet proposals in Geneva and to prove that the United States has to take steps to "nudge" the USSR into holding constructive talks. How? The answer is always the same -- by making plans to deploy new strategic weapons systems, above all MX missiles. But, in the first place, the USSR is a determined advocate of successful talks on a just basis and needs no "nudging" in that direction. Second, programs for a further strategic arms buildup will not force our country to make unilateral concessions. The USSR will be compelled to respond to the U.S. challenge by deploying its own corresponding weapons systems. In stating this, the USSR is issuing no threats but is calling on U.S. leaders to visualize the real situation and to realize that disarmament must not be combined with new rounds of the arms race.

The Soviet Union had and has no aggressive intentions. And that is what is borne out by its proposal of a broad program of concrete measures leading to the cessation of the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race, the easing of international tension and the safegarding of the security of all the peoples.

It is particularly important to adopt such decisions now that the danger of war has grown so much and the world is on the threshhold of a new round in the "Eurostrategic" arms race planned by the United States and NATO and the creation of even more destructive strategic weapons systems. Time brooks no delay. The year 1983 could be the turning point in the development of the world situation if realism prevails in Washington and the other NATO capitals. The year that has just begun must be that turning point. That is the demand of Soviet people and all people of good will. The immediate future will show whether that demand will be met. The stance adopted by Washington at the talks now resumed in Geneva will demonstrate the extent to which its assurances of adherence to the cause of peace measure up to the facts. As for our country, then "the Soviet Union," as Yu. V. Andropov has stated, "will do its utmost to ensure a calm and peaceful future for this and future generations. This is the aim of our policy and we shall not deviate from it."

MEETING OF SOCIALIST RADIO, TV LEADERS HELD

LD042330 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] The working meeting of leaders of television and radio organizations of Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, GDR, Kampuchea, Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, USSR and Czechoslovakia took place in Moscow on 2-3 February. The participants exchanged experiences about the (?elucidation) of the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, and the congresses of other fraternal parties, and the further perfecting of promotional and propaganda work using television and radio. Emphasis was laid on the necessity to further develop wide, scale and multi-faceted cooperation in a demonstration of the achievements of real socialism, in promoting the fight against the arms race and for disarmament, the consolidation of detente, the strengthening of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social structures.

Those taking part in the meeting discussed the interpretation of important forthcoming events in the life of the countries of socialism; the 100th anniversary of the death and the 165th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx, the 60th anniversary of the CPSU, the 40th anniversary of the major battles in the great patriotic war, the (?propaganda) of the political Declaration adopted in Prague (?by us and the states) of the Warsaw Pact.

Talks With Chernenko

LD041914 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Talks were held today in the CPSU Central Committee between Comrade Chernenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and leaders of television and radio organization from Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, GDR, Kampuchea, Cuba, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia who have arrived in Moscow for a regular working meeting.

Taking part in the talks were Comrade Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Comrade Stukalin, head of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee; and Comrade Lapin, chairman of the USSR Gosteleradio. The talks took place in a warm and comradely atmosphere.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD061800 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0945 GMT 6 Feb 83

["International Observers Roundtable" program with IZVESTIYA political observer Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich Bovin, international affairs journalist Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and all-union-radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

Bush's West Europe Visit

[Text] [Levin] Hello, respected comrade listeners. This week has been marked by a most grandiose and theatrical action by the American Administration which found expression in U.S. Vice President Bush's tour of Western Europe. This journey was designed above all to convince the West European public that the Washington administration is allegedly endeavoring to find mutually acceptable solutions for pressing international problems. As experience has shown, the main task lay in publicizing current U.S. foreign policy and persuading Western Europe to support it.

[Bovin] Here -- forgive me Viktor Nikolayevich -- there is a kind of hidden irony in the plan itself, because they are now writing about this mission of Bush's saying that it is a very delicate one, a very difficult mission, and very important mission. So what is this mission?

All the delicacy, difficulty and importance lies in the fact that Bush must prove that Reagan seriously intends, let us say, to disarm. Reagan if you please, has been sitting in the White House for 2 years, the chief ally of Western Europe, and he has to send the vice president specially to demonstrate that he is engaged in a serious policy in the White House. Thus, at the basis of this mission there lies this amusing point.

[Levin] Moreover, I have formed the impression that the West Europeans, who on the whole support the American course, have been hinting that perhaps it would be a good thing if Bush were to demonstrate some readiness on the part of the Washington administration to be flexible. Hints were being dropped on the eve of his visit that the United States -- this week the negotiations on restricting and reducing strategic arms resumed and last week the talks began on nuclear weapons in Europe -- ought to be prepared at the Geneva negotiations to demonstrate a more realistic, a more balanced approach to the problems under discussion. But these hints, these urgent calls, I would even say, addressed to the American Administration... [Bovin interrupts]

[Bovin] Groans -- I would say -- groans.

[Levin] Groans too. They made no impression on Washington.

[Bovin] Here, in my view, judging by what the Americans themselves have been writing at home -- evidently there was some sort of argument. I have the impression that the State Department wanted, in fact, to give Bush some new instructions or directives so that he would be able to say something there provisionally, but the Pentagon held firmly to the position that there should only be the zero option. And, incidentally, on this point, Weinberger's fervor is beginning to produce some irritation in America, even among Republicans, even among rightwingers. And of late some articles have appeared saying that it is planned to tactfully transfer Weinberger, the secretary for defense, somewhere.

[Shishlin] And I have the impression that the European reaction in this visit by Bush is somehow blurred. As if on the one hand the Europeans are saying that, of course, the zero option is preferable, yet in their minds they seem to want to say "but... [Bovin interrupts]

[Bovin] Yes, the interesting thing is that they've learned the formula by heart: Of course, the best option is the zero option, but then they have this "but" at the back of their minds.

Bush, of course, also understands this, but he says nothing about it. All the Europeans are thinking about it, and some of them are even saying it openly.

[Shishlin] There are three elements in Reagan's message to the people of Europe, as it is grandiosely named, three elements in essence: this same notorious zero; then Reagan's pledge to hold a firm nuclear umbrella over Europe; and the third element is his readiness to meet the Soviet leader, a widely proclaimed readiness to meet him anywhere whenever it suits him.

[Levin] But at the same time, as experience has shown, particularly as Bush's speech in West Berlin showed, the United States has not given in either to the groans ringing out in Western Europe or to those realistic voices which can be heard in the State Department, but rather sets a hard line on the zero option. And it seems to me that in this respect Bush's speech in West Berlin was very indicative, indicative above all in that the whole conception of it was built on the fact that for him, for Bush, West Berlin is a front-line city -- that is, he approaches it from cold war positions, and the same notes which characterized the atmosphere of the cold war can be heard in his speech. But if we are to talk about the essence of this speech, it is nothing but distortions. I will adduce only one example: This is how Bush interprets the well-known NATO decision. He says: In the first place the dual decision provides for developing NATO arms systems in Europe and in the second place for starting talks with the Soviet Union on reducing the level of these arms on both sides.

[Bovin] But in the dual decision everything was precisely the other way round.

[Levin] Precisely the other way round.

[Bovin] To start talks, and if they failed, then...[Levin interrupts]

[Levin] Quite right, and it is no accident that the FRG SPD [Social Democratic Party] candidate for the post of chancellor, Vogel, adduced this very point from the document. In the official text of the communique published after the December session of the NATO Council it was plainly stated that NATO's need for theater nuclear weapons would be reviewed in the light of tangible results achieved at the negotiations. This is not a new argument, incidentally. Which should come first: topping up arms levels, as they say in the West -- that is, deploying new U.S. nuclear missiles and then holding talks; or holding talks first and resolving these problems according to the outcome of the talks. Bush's visit, his speeches, his meetings in Geneva -- incidentally, in Geneva he met the leaders of the Soviet delegations to the talks with the Americans -- clearly showed that the U.S. Administration is continuing to cling stubbornly to the zero option.

[Bovin] But here a decisive role for them is evidently played, I think, perhaps not by the zero option itself -- I think that even the Americans have already realized in principle that it will not get through -- but by tactical considerations related to the situation in the FRG. The way they reason is this: If they show any wavering now over the zero option, they will sink Kohl at the election, since he too is holding tight, so to speak, to the zero option.

This option is regarded as a lifejacket for Kohl, but the situation might develop in such a way that it will become not a lifejacket but a kind of weight which could pull the CDU [Christian Democratic Union] to the bottom.

[Shishlin] I think that the Americans wanted to create the impression that they could perfectly well come to an agreement with Western Europe on the basis of their zero option, and by the same token contrive an additional factor by which to exert pressure on the Soviet Union and influence the Soviet Union's stance so that our country would go even further to accommodate the American position.

And it is no accident that they declare that on the whole the Soviet Union should move its position further than the American spokesmen should his position at the talks in Geneva.

[Bovin] But the Americans themselves, for example, think in other ways too. For example, in the latest issue of the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT there is this article. It begins -- I will read the first paragraph: If, during his 12-day tour of the allied capitals, Vice President George Bush heeds the true voice of Europe, he will return to Washington with the following disturbing news: The United States is losing the battle with the Soviet Union, a battle which will greatly influence the future of the North Atlantic alliance. If the Reagan administration wishes to avert ultimate defeat in the future, it must show great adroitness at the Geneva arms talks. This is the way, so to speak, a fairly rightwing American magazine sums up Bush's visit.

[Levin] You know, I am forming the impression that Reagan nevertheless holds to the view that the West European allies will swallow everything. They are imposing the zero option on them, and Western Europe will have nowhere to turn.

[Bovin] They have put it on the table many times before, in my opinion....

FRG Elections

[Levin] But he is continuing to insist I would say that this imperious self-assurance continues to prevail. And the result, well, as you know, is that very same speech by Bush, the very same speculative message to the people of Europe. This provoked a reaction in West Europe such as there has maybe never been before; with the most amazing unanimity many -- in fact virtually all -- West European papers wrote that this is an empty proposal, that there is nothing in it, that this is just a cheap show. THE TIMES of Britain, for instance, writes: When the publicity aspect of the matter puts into the shade the real state of affairs the thought inevitably arises about the artificiality of the entire matter at hand. The weakness of Mr Reagan's proposal is not merely that he appears to be proposing a symbolic summit conference of this sort, but that the purpose of his meeting with the Soviet leader -- judging by everything -- would be for them to put their names to an agreement which is not even hinted at as yet.

Further on THE TIMES touches on the question of relations with the FRG; the form of the initiative -- this is talking about Reagan's initiative -- raises the suspicion that it has been designed as a move in the propaganda battle rather than in the disarmament negotiations. That suspicion has been intensified by the theatrical way in which it was presented. An open letter to the people of Europe -- I am quoting from THE TIMES -- that was read by the vice president toward the end of a speech in West Berlin, without the Soviet Union having previously been informed, is a strange way to expound a delicate diplomatic idea. So strange, indeed, that it seems to have provoked such criticism in West Germany that the entire venture has boomeranged even as propaganda.

[Bovin] That precisely raises the more general question of how foreign policy is planned in the White House and who does this. Because from any viewpoint you could ask the question in any political kindergarten in Europe and they would all say that such a message will not work. And Reagan has decided on the precise way to arm Bush. Well, he has armed him with this bombshell, which he considered to be a propaganda bombshell, which will blow up and the pieces will, so to speak, fall on the Soviet Union, although elementary considerations showed that nothing will come of this.

And when the following day Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov replied to Reagan in his well-known interview and when he of course said no, for Europe this was completely, so to put it, understandable because everyone understands that the Soviet Union cannot accept Reagan's proposal.

[Shishlin] An interesting episode took place: White House Assistant Press Secretary Speakes spoke to journalists, and he said no more or less than the following: The American Administration very much regrets that the Soviet leader has given such a rapid reply and that, supposedly, Reagan's proposal has not received serious study. But then the journalists asked Speakes what is the content of his proposal, what is new in it. Speakes fell silent. Speakes remained silent and the journalists began to laugh. They were laughing because there is really nothing new in it, absolutely nothing new. Quite simply it leads nowhere.

[Bovin] A cheap bit of propaganda.

[Levin] And of course this caused quite the opposite effect than what the Washington administration intended, and in particular as far as West Germany was concerned. The missile problem indisputably is of great importance to all the states of Europe, but the Americans probably correctly consider that the chief objective to which they must direct special attention at the present time is West Germany.

[Bovin] Yes, of course. After all, that is where the Pershings are to be deployed.

[Levin] And in West Germany elections to the Bundestag are to be held in a month's time, elections whose outcome is very, very unclear, for the disposition of forces...

[Bovin] It is of interest. Of course, everyone is thinking about this. Here, for instance, the French weekly PARIS MATCH has put a couple of questions to NATO Secretary-General Luns.

Here is the first question: There are to be elections in the FRG in March: Are you afraid that their outcome might change West Germany's attitude toward the deployment of Pershing and cruise missiles on their territory?

And here is Luns' reply: I am extremely concerned, since the 6 March elections will have an enormous effect on the development of NATO's nuclear policy. And I'll go further: If the outcome of those elections leads to the formation of a government opposed to the deployment of Pershing and cruise missiles then it cannot be ruled out that the Benelux countries and then Italy might follow this example.

And the magazine asks: And what would happen then?

Luns replies: NATO will then be in a very serious crisis.

[Levin] The crisis about which Luns talks is effectively already here. It was not by chance that even the West German Government press and information office, the official government service, published the results of a poll conducted among the FRG population by the social research institute SINUS-Muenchen. And what does this poll show? That 61 percent of the FRG population considers that if an accord is not reached at the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe by this fall then deployment of the missiles should be postponed. Furthermore, 65 percent of SDP voters and 54 percent of CDU/CSU voters were for the deployment deadline to be moved and for talks to be continued.

And there is an interesting point here: Kohl, FRG chancellor and CDU candidate for head of government at the coming elections, made a statement the day before yesterday in which he said that on the whole no changes could be expected at Geneva in the next month, that any changes should come only after 6 March, thus hinting that U.S. policy will supposedly depend on what kind of government is in power in Bonn. And he clearly means that if the CDU/CSU bloc is returned to power, with or without the Free Democrats -- that is a very hypothetical question -- then the Americans might show greater flexibility for solving this problem, otherwise it will be worse. In other words, he is now trying to recruit votes in all ways. But the West Germans are sufficiently clearly aware of the threat entailed in the deployment of these weapons, and that indisputably influences the run up to the elections.

[Shishlin] It seems to be that among all the passionate concerns affecting not only the West German voter, but which this election campaign is attracting in the world as a whole, some kind of very major, very important political values are present in essence in the pre-election platforms of all the contending groups; because Kohl too -- just look -- tries repeatedly to stress that he is prepared to continue the so-called Ostpolitik, to inject fresh real meaning into it, and he is now already saying that he will be prepared to visit Moscow once he becomes chancellor as a result of the coming election. The fact remains that elections in West Germany have shown how vital is the problem of the outcome [razvyazka] as regards nuclear weapons in Europe for the fate of West Germany and for the fate of Europe.

And irrespective of the outcome of the West German elections -- and probably no one will dare to predict it yet, though everyone is making forecasts -- this problem nevertheless will not go away of its own accord. And if the spring proves to be more or less a dead period as far as progress on the problem of nuclear weapons in Europe is concerned, I am thinking that it will be impossible to say this about the summer which is not far off.

[Bovin] A funny thing is occurring in Europe now: Probably the staunchest support in Europe for Reagan and his zero option comes from the French and not from the Germans or the British (?who conceal this support). But as for Mitterrand, there is his well-known speech in Bonn and his subsequent interview. What paradox it is that precisely a socialist government in France is now probably the most hardline in its backing for the very same zero option to be carried through whatever the conditions. Well, we can debate at great length why this is so. Of course, Mitterrand is frightened by what he sees as the growth of neutralist feeling in West Germany. This is an age-old fear for the French. Then, so to speak, there are his own independent forces which have now been drawn into the whirlpool of all these proposals concerning Euro-strategic forces; and the French position is well-known: That is, these are our independent forces and they are not to be touched. And in fact they are continuing to build them up: They deployed nine new missiles recently.

[Levin] Yes, it is curious that the total power of these French missiles now amounts to approximately 85 megatons, which is equivalent to the power of 5,660 nuclear bombs like that which the United States dropped on Hiroshima.

[Bovin] Yes, it is quite a heafty thing [Veshch] and as far as range goes they are quite capable of reaching our territory.

[Levin] Some 3,500 km.

[Bovin] Thus this is quite unexpected support from a state which is not even a member of the NATO military organization, and of course there will be no American missiles on French territory. That, of course, is why it is easier for Mitterrand to engage in a discourse than, say, for Kohl or Colombo.

[Levin] The French have their own fingers on the button, but the West Germans the issue remains that while the missiles will be on West German territory, the Americans will still be in charge of them. In Britain, too, at the moment, a great deal is being said about the necessity of having joint control [Bovin interrupts]

[Bovin] Yes, that is also being discussed there.

[Levin] But, you see, I would say that this is one of the compromise solutions -- compromises which in no way benefit detente and in no way benefit the consolidation of the international situation.

[Bovin] This compromise is political, but from the military-technological point of view it will in general present difficulties; by the time an agreement is reached the war will be ending.

[Levin] Let's hope to God it doesn't start in the first place.

[Bovin] Yes, that goes without saying.

[Levin] And yet another matter which, of course, is making itself felt both in West Germany -- it is making itself felt very strongly there -- and in the entire capitalist world is the economic problem. Recently the Federal Department for Labor Affairs published statistics in the FRG which showed that in the space of only a month, January, the number of unemployed in the FRG went up by 12 percent. And, at the moment, 2 in every 11 citizens in the FRG has no job. The record for this is held by Belgium; again for January there was a fresh rise in unemployment. The level of unemployment in the country is 18.1 percent. This is an extremely high level; one in every six Belgians is out of work. And in Britain the figure is one in seven. In the United States 1 in every 10 is out of work. In these conditions, of course, there are economic problems. Undoubtedly, they constitute a very important factor in the electorate's view of the political platforms of the rival parties, but also, in general, in the appraisal of policy as a whole. For a realistic policy, a positive policy, is manifested not in such theatrical actions as the message, the address, by Reagan to the people of Europe, but in deeds.

[Shishlin] The theatrical actions also reflect a policy, of course. It is another matter as to what policy they express.

[Levin] Well, it is reflected precisely in the fact that it masks, it disguises, the true intention. The true intention was expressed very clearly in the message, the economic message of Reagan to Congress, in which he demanded an unprecedented sum for military expenditure -- $208.5 billion. This means that the budget allocation for military requirements should go up by 14 percent.

This is, of course, a point which cannot fail to be noticed, which shows that Reagan is stubbornly steering a course towards militarization, towards the arms race.

Economic Problems

[Bovin] Of course, all these economic problems have gone beyond the bounds of individual states in the capitalist world. It is a sort of common situation now in the West, which is variously called the recession, the crisis, chaos, or whatever. Recently Kissinger published a quite interesting article, a long article, entitled "How To Save the World Economy." Well, as we know, Kissinger thinks in terms of global categories. And his thoughts might well be boiled down to the fact that none of the capitalist countries can by its own efforts extricate itself from these economic difficulties. From his point of view there is only one way out of the situation: the strengthening of coordination of economic policy by the entire capitalist world. That means establishing some sort of stronger framework, perhaps consultations of the seven. Something must be done within the framework of the tripartite commission, in his view, etc, etc. In general, he rather gloomily forecasts that if the capitalist world fails to reach this coordination of economic policy, if it fails to summon up collective strength somehow to achieve closer cooperation, then the world could be on the brink of an economic catastrophe. We will consider this, so to speak, the view of a theoretician. In practice, everything is far more difficult, because we can see from the attempts which are repeated every year at the meetings of the seven -- and at the moment they are starting to prepare one of these regular meetings: it is not far off -- that absolutely nothing is gained in practical terms. So they all talk together, and then they each run back to their home countries and begin feverishly to save themselves, so to speak, even at the expense of drowning the others, perhaps with the help of protectionism, with the help of all sorts of currency machinations, etc, and so on. It is a common disease now in the capitalist world.

[Levin] At the same time, nonetheless, I get the impression that there is one issue on which the United States is trying very persistently to bring about a united stand by all the capitalist countries: that is the issue of trade with the socialist countries. The line of discrimination in that trade is becoming more and more vividly expressed, and, incidentally, Bush, in the course of his tour of the West European countries, has devoted a great amount of attention to this problem.

[Shishlin] At this point I would say that the United States does not, in fact, treat all the socialist countries in the same way. I think it would be right to say that U.S. policy in the economic sphere, with all its hardline attitudes, restrictions and so forth, is spearheaded first and foremost against the Soviet Union. But that does not mean it is only against the Soviet Union that the United States wants to apply economic levers to produce an effect. It is using these levers actively against socialist Poland, and, as our Polish comrades have said, Western policy toward Poland did not change, even after martial law was lifted in the country.

But under the circumstances, what can one do? We don't intend to try and persuade the capitalist world to behave sensibly where normal business relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist states are concerned. As they say, you can't force someone to be pleasant. In this respect we are ready to build relations only on an equal basis, and our chief response, of course, does not consist of attempts to exert some sort of influence on the United States, although we are not against holding talks with the United States. The chief response by the socialist states is to improve the unity of our own efforts -- in other words, the development of socialist economic integration, as it is called. And the socialist world, even though the socialist countries also come up against no small difficulties in their development, has, of course, every opportunity to make more confident and more rapid progress. And the best accelerating factor here is this coordination of economic policies.

[Levin] This, incidentally, was a topic at a recent meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo which discussed questions connected with preparations for a summit-level economic conference of the CEMA member-countries.

[Shishlin] Yes, that will be a major event, although the date for the meeting has not yet been set. Preparations for it, however, are very actively in hand, and the basic directions that those preparations are taking indicate that the decisions that are planned to be taken and the process of the formulation of those decisions are aimed at promoting the development of the national economies of the socialist states and the solution of the general problems of interest to all the socialist-countries.

[Bovin] Well, I think that as our time is running out it would be a good idea, Viktor Nikolayevich, to end our talk today on that note.

[Levin] It only remains for us to thank our listeners for tuning in. Goodbye, comrades.

BUSH ACTIVITIES IN GENEVA SUBJECT OF COMMENT

Speaks to Disarmament Committee

LD041840 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1745 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Geneva, 4 Feb (TASS) -- Correspondent Georgiy Dragunov reports:

Geneva is one of the stops on U.S. Vice President Bush's 12-day tour of Western Europe. As is known, this tour -- whatever the propaganda veil with which it might cover itself -- is being undertaken to convince the West European public of the U.S. "love of peace" and to exert pressure for the implementation of dangerous plans to deploy new U.S. medium-range nuclear weapons on the continent. An attempt is also being made to somehow neutralize the great allure of the new peace initiatives of the USSR and the other socialist countries, which have evoked such a lively response among the West European public.

Descending from the aircraft at the airport today, Bush stated that he had arrived in the city "which is a center of disarmament talks." But what did the U.S. vice president bring to Geneva?

Bush's lengthy speech at today's meeting of the Disarmament Committee did not contain anything new or any constructive elements which would have demonstrated the United States' serious intention to promote the success of the talks on the questions on the committee's agenda, the talks on the problem of limiting and reducing strategic armaments, and also the talks on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe. Striving to present the U.S. Administration as a "champion" of disarmament, Bush in every way publicized President Reagan's notorious "zero option," depicting it as the only possible solution of the question of limiting nuclear armaments in Europe. At the same time, Bush deliberately distorted the policy of the USSR in the sphere of disarmament. He did not fail to repeat the absurd fantasies about the use of Soviet-made chemical weapons in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia, even though this malicious lie has long since been unmasked by the world public.

Taking the floor, V.L. Israelyan, the USSR representative in the Disarmament Committee, drew the attention of its participants to the answers of Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of CPSU Central Committee, to the questions of a PRAVDA correspondent in which the fundamental position of the USSR is stated. These answers were distributed today in the Geneva Palace of Nations as an official document of the Disarmament Committee.

The Soviet representative gave a deserved rebuff to the anti-Soviet fabrications of the U.S. vice president.

Asserts U.S. 'Moral Position'

LD041950 Moscow World Service in English 1700 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Addressing the UN Disarmament Committee in Geneva, Vice President George Bush defended the administration's zero option. Some reports by major news agencies say it was a passionate speech. Our observer, Igor Dmitriyev, takes a look at some of its logical drawbacks.

Mr Bush has said, and I quote, ours is a moral position. What's wrong with eliminating from the face of the earth an entire class of missiles? According to the United States vice president, the Soviet Union seeks to preserve monopoly over the United States in medium-range missiles. Calling the administration's zero option not a take-it-or-leave-it proposition, Mr Bush said: I say to the Soviet leadership: Come up with your own plan to banish these missiles; we are ready to consider initiatives that will achieve that goal.

Well, to begin with the Soviet Union has proposed to banish all nuclear weapons in Europe -- medium-range and tactical. It amounts to making Europe a nuclear-free zone. If the American position is as moral as Mr Bush would have us believe, why did the United States not accept it? Since the United States is not ready for such a radical step, the Soviet Union has proposed to reduce its medium-range missiles to the level currently maintained by Britain and France, and not a single missile more. No matter what the British and French call their nuclear missiles -- independent or strategic -- these weapons are in Europe and aimed at the Soviet Union. In these circumstances the morality of the United States, which wants to add almost 600 nuclear missiles to this arsenal and its own forward-based systems, is questionable.

As far as monopoly over this or that weapon goes, the United States never had any qualms about being the first to introduce various weapons systems like, say, MIRVed warheads or the long-range cruise missile. Claiming that it wants to end Soviet monopoly on medium-range missiles, the administration wants to site them in countries from where they can reach Soviet territory. At the same time, Soviet missiles of this class cannot reach the United States, so it's not ending Soviet monopoly but ending rough military equivalence in Europe that the United States wants. The 572 American missiles in Western Europe will be a weighty supplement to the American strategic arsenal because of their proximity to Soviet borders.

The trip of George Bush to Europe is seen by many Western observers as a propaganda effort to sell the notoriously one-sided zero option to its allies and also to play down the recent Soviet proposals. The administration has nothing to offer but its zero option that leads nowhere because it seeks unilateral Soviet disarmament. This American proposal cannot be a sound basis for talks. The administration seems to be well aware of this, but, I repeat, it has nothing else to offer because its ultimate goal is to deploy new missiles in Europe at any cost. That's why the zero option is being wrapped like a gift package by American officials. Yesterday it was in the form of a far-reaching disarmament proposal: Today it is in the form of the President's open letter to the people of Europe.

Mr Bush has told the United Nations Disarmament Committee in Geneva that the American position is moral. Another member of the administration, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, signed a memorandum to a secret Pentagon document which provides for a first nuclear strike by the United States by both medium-range and battlefield nuclear arms in Europe. This is double morality.

'Leak' on Arms Control Initiative

PM041019 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jan 83 p 9

[Report by correspondent Anatoliy Manakov under the rubric "Continuing the Theme": "On the Track of a News 'Leak'"]

[Text] New York -- Looking ahead to U.S. Vice President G. Bush's visit to Western Europe, the Washington correspondent of THE NEW YORK TIMES announced that the administration's representative was not traveling empty-handed. Citing anonymous "sources in the administration," he reported: When he addresses the Geneva UN Disarmament Committee, it is thought that G. Bush intends to announce, in particular, a U.S. initiative in the arms control sphere -- on an agreement prohibiting the use of chemical weapons. Together with other initiatives its purpose is allegedly to counter the "increasingly successful Soviet peace offensive."

Even if this news "leak" is true, one might react to this "initiative" in exactly the same way as Washington is currently reacting to the constructive Soviet proposals on limiting the arms race: "So what's new? We've seen it all before." But let us not repeat the hackneyed cliches. Let us just poke around and try to find out who loosened what "valve" to create the right effect at the right time among West European public circles.

As is known, all European affairs in the State Department are currently in the hands of Richard Burt, who was THE NEW YORK TIMES correspondent at the Pentagon prior to joining the administration. He was chiefly responsible for the propaganda campaign concerning the patently fictitious use of Soviet chemical weapons in Southeast Asia and Afghanistan, a campaign which failed ignominiously.

As recently as 6 years ago Richard Burt was a scientific assistant at London's International Institute for Strategic Studies and he prepared a study for the Pentagon on the role of chemical warfare methods in the eighties. In his treatise he actually pointed out the need for structural changes in NATO in order to strengthen its military potential "below the nuclear threshold." More precisely, he tied up the bloc's nuclear potential with its "chemical warfare doctrine" and the renunciation of first use of nuclear weapons with the renunciation of first use of chemical weapons. It is hard to imagine that Richard Burt could have made a 180-degree turn.

The value of Washington's "leak" is clear from the Reagan administration's approach to other means of warfare closely related to chemicals. Back in 1972 the U.S. Administration signed a convention banning biological and toxin weapons. In fact, the development of them is still going on as before. Only a year ago Jonathan King, professor of biology at MIT, confirmed at a scientific association meeting: The potential use of biological weapons remains a topic of research.

After that we are asked to believe that the U.S. vice president's intentions are sincere!

Meets With Soviet Delegates

LD041643 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 4 Feb 82

[Text] Geneva February 4 TASS -- Meetings were held here today, at the request of the American side, of the heads of the delegations of the USSR at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear arms limitations in Europe and on strategic arms limitations and reductions -- Yuliy Kvitsinskiy and Viktor Karpov, with the U.S. Vice-President George Bush.

Talks With U.S. Representatives

LD050002 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 2010 GMT 4 Feb 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Kaverznev]

[Text] U.S. Vice President Bush has had a meeting in Geneva with the U.S. delegation at the talks with the Soviet Union on nuclear weapons in Europe and on the limitation of strategic armaments. On the eve of this meeting Bush stressed that he wants to grasp the mood reigning in Geneva and to let it be clearly understood that Reagan -- according to Bush -- is absolutely serious on the issue of arms control. As you know, Bush has brought to Europe no new or compromise proposals as was being strongly hinted by the Western press.

The vice president also had a meeting today with the leader of the Soviet delegation in Geneva.

COMMENTARY CONTINUES ON PURPOSE OF VISIT

Reagan's Open Letter Assessed

LD050256 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Vice President George Bush continues his West European tour. He is to visit seven countries in 12 days and see the pope in the Vatican. Here now is a commentary by Stanislav Kondrashov on this lightning tour:

A few days ago George Bush admitted he was not sure that even West European friends of the United States, as he called them, fully realized the seriousness of President Reagan's desire to reach an understanding on arms limitation. This statement, made by the vice president at a press conference before his European tour, showed that the purpose of the visit is to work for such an understanding. But it is not clear how Americans intend to persuade their allies if the political baggage of this truly consultative mission, as George Bush termed it, contains much talk and absolutely no action.

No matter what beautiful words the American official might have used, it is unlikely that he won over the 5,000 West Germans who responded to the American delegation's arrival in West Berlin by staging a demonstration against the policy of the United States and new American missiles on the territory of their country. The European public is urging the White House to take concrete steps to reduce tension and remove the threat of nuclear catastrophe -- and not more statements.

These demands are all the more justified today because Moscow has already gone half way to an understanding at the Geneva talks. At the end of last December the Soviet Union came out with new constructive proposals on medium-range weapons in Europe. It does not want medium range or tactical nuclear arms on the continent. Since the United States does not agree to it, the Soviet Union is prepared for a solution under which it would have the same amount of missiles as the NATO side has in Europe today. At the same time, the sides should reach agreement in limiting the number of aircraft carrying medium-range nuclear weapons to an equal level. This would promote complete parity in missiles and aircraft: equality on a much lower level than now.

The Soviet Union is ready to sign such an agreement. These proposals have been submitted at the current round of the Geneva talks and the Soviet side is waiting for an answer. The mission of Vice President Bush can serve as an answer. Instead of taking practical measures to meet the constructive Soviet proposals half way, the American official is trying to counteract the peace offensive from the East and seeks counterarguments.

If Europeans had any hopes about the flexibility of the American policy on medium-range nuclear arms in Europe, these hopes were destroyed by the open letter of the United States President to the people of Europe read by George Bush at a banquet in West Berlin on Monday. The letter is another attempt by President Reagan to assure allies that his administration wants an agreement with the Soviet Union on reducing the nuclear threat, but even Western observers have noted that the document proposes nothing more than what is already being discussed in Geneva. The letter speaks of one and the same zero option. It is generally recognised that the zero option is unacceptable to the Soviet Union. Can anyone speak seriously of a proposal under which the Soviet Union would have to dismantle all of its medium-range missiles while the United States and its NATO allies would keep all of its nuclear weapons of this category?

In the same letter President Reagan proposes a meeting with Soviet leader Yuriy Andropov to sign a nuclear arms agreement that he knows is unacceptable to the Soviet Union. The American leadership is not showing a serious approach to the issue. The letter is meant more for propaganda aimed to curb antimissile and anti-American sentiments among the public in Western Europe, rather than to limit Euromissiles. In some respects the purely propaganda nature of Bush's tour has been taken to absurd extremes.

Last week President Reagan and Vice President Bush received West German Foreign Minister Genscher in Washington, discussed their attitude to the Geneva talks on medium-range arms, and pledged allegiance to the zero option. And now George Bush has met Chancellor Kohl in Bonn, discussed the same things, and the results were the same. Why? Those who predicted the failure of Bush's mission from the very first day were fairly safe, because Mr Bush has been engaged in empty political publicity rather than real political work for peace.

It is unlikely that such exercises in public diplomacy which has become fashionable in Washington satisfy people in West Germany, the Netherlands, Britain, Italy and Belgium, the countries visited by the high-ranking envoy of the United States Administration, which wants to turn its allies into launching pads for American missiles.

Europe's 'Skeptical' Reaction

LD062123 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Feb 83

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin; video clips show Bush being met by Genscher and other officials at airport, Bush sitting with Genscher and Bush inspecting honor guard with Kohl]

[Text] Things have now reached such a state that Reagan has had to send his vice president, Bush, to West Europe in order to convince the West Europeans that Reagan seriously intends to disarm. Much is written and spoken here about the trip by Bush to West Europe as about the trip by Shultz to Asia, and so I will confine myself to just a few characteristic points.

I will read from an article by Brzezinski, which he published in THE NEW YORK TIMES. This is what he writes: It is a sad fact that the missions to West Europe and China by Vice President Bush and Secretary of State Shultz are rescue operations, and by no means two branches of a successful global strategy intended to stabilize the conflict between East and West. Well, saving Reagan's authority is not one of the easiest tasks, of course, and the President decided to help his rescuer. He entrusted to him, Bush, an open letter to the people of Europe, and Bush solemnly proclaimed it in West Berlin, this is what that appeal said in part: I have asked Vice President Bush, while speaking in the city where East meets West, to propose to Andropov, the Soviet general secretary, that he and I should meet whenever and wherever he likes to sign an agreement removing from the face of the earth American and Soviet land-based intermediate-range nuclear weapons.

You all well know Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's reply, and of course we were unable to give any other answer. We were unable to occupy any other position. This is even being recalled in West Europe. And in West Europe attitudes to Reagan's appeal are very, very skeptical. I will cite just one example of an utterance from the London TIMES. THE TIMES writes: The form of this initiative arouses suspicion because it was planned as a step in a propaganda campaign and not at the disarmament talks. This suspicion was intensified by the theatrical manner in which it was imparted: open letter which was read by the vice president in Berlin without informing the Soviet Union beforehand. This is a strange method of expounding a delicate diplomatic idea. It was so strange that it has evidently evoked such criticism in West Germany that the whole scheme has produced the opposite effect even on the propaganda level. This is what has happened in the end.

In my view this mood, which is typical of West Europe, has been successfully expressed by one of the editors of the Hamburg weekly DIE ZEIT, (Josef Joffe). This is what he has written: The zero option has become a problem which causes a headache, but how are we to get rid of it without cutting off our own heads? Realists, and not just among the Europeans, are giving this desperate advice: Take half a loaf and run, which means zero deployment for the West in exchange for a maximum reduction in Soviet missiles. (Joffe) continues: And yet the stakes have become too high to be able to present a retreat as flexibility. For the West a genuine way out consists in choosing not between the zero option and the 572 Pershing missiles and medium-range cruise missiles but between a certain number or nothing.

And now, to sum up, we may say that Bush will hardly succeed in enhancing confidence in the policy and the intentions of his boss.

It is true that not all of the Americans' intentions have to be questioned. Reagan recently announced that he intended to sign a special proclamation, declaring this year the year of the Bible. The President said: We want to meet the future with the Bible. And this was, of course, said seriously. It is just a pity that when Reagan changes from the Bible to missiles he loses his seriousness.

Soviet Stand Misrepresented

LD062353 Moscow in Portuguese to Portugal 1930 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] U.S. Vice President George Bush is continuing his tour of West European countries. To judge from his numerous utterances in the European captials, George Bush has been sent on this transatlatic journey to convince the allies to lend their unconditional support for the so-called zero option, which in reality amounts to a plan for the unilateral nuclear disarmament of the USSR.

In his propaganda exercise for the already tarnished zero option, the U.S. vice president does not hesitate to resort to anti-Soviet fabrications and to the falsification of the true facts. Thus, speaking in West Berlin, George Bush stated that the only option deemed acceptable by the Russians is the preservation of their own monopoly of nuclear weapons systems capable of hitting European targets. In this connection Viktor Shlenov comments:

There are two big lies in Mr Bush's statements: First, the USSR never had and does not have a monopoly on medium-range nuclear weapons. Weapons of this type are held by the United States -- 700 bombers deployed in forward bases -- and by Britain and France -- some 300 missiles and bombers. All of these weapons, with ranges of 1,000 to 4,500 km, can reach targets anywhere in the European part of the USSR. And, by the way, the NATO countries' medium-range weapons can carry, on a single launch, a nuclear payload 1 and a half times more powerful than the corresponding Soviet figures.

Second, the USSR had never limited itself to a single option for nuclear disarmament in Europe. In recent years the USSR has submitted a whole range of specific proposals which also took into account the views of the Western governments.

As is known, the USSR proposed the conclusion of an agreement on renouncing all kinds of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical, targeted on the European Continent. This proposal met with Washington's hostility, while both Britain and France said they had no intention of renouncing nuclear weapons. Taking into account the stand of the United States and the two European nuclear powers, the USSR proposed that it and the NATO countries should reduce the number of their medium-range weapons by a factor in excess of three. Under this option there would be no Soviet or U.S. medium-range missiles balancing each other's numbers in Europe, and the USSR would keep only as many as those held by Britain and France.

In order to attain a general military balance, agreement must of course also be reached on reducing the number of aircraft carrying medium-range nuclear weapons maintained in Europe by the USSR and the NATO countries until parity is reached.

And here is yet another example of the Soviet Union's unstinting efforts to reduce the nuclear threat in Europe: A few days ago the USSR expressed support for Sweden's proposal for the creation in Europe of a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons, and in turn proposed that this zone be deepened to a range of 500 - 600 km. This proposal was received more than coldly by NATO Headquarters.

The question arises: Why is Mr Bush misrepresenting the Soviet stance on reducing nuclear armaments in Europe? The answer is that he does so in a bid -- or so it would seem -- to convince the West European countries of the USSR's obstinacy and, to the accompaniment of the propaganda on Soviet military superiority, to speed up the implementation of the plans to deploy new U.S. missiles.

DISCUSSIONS WITH ITALIAN LEADERS PREVIEWED

One of 'Most Reliable' Allies

LD052106 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 5 Feb 83

[Text] Rome, 5 Feb (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova reports:

U.S. Vice President G. Bush arrives in Italy today on an official 3-day visit. He is making a long trip to the West European capitals in an attempt to persuade the allies not to oppose the deployment of American nuclear missiles in Western Europe and to support the so-called "zero option" proposed by Washington and rejected by the Soviet Union as totally unacceptable. "This journey is the most difficult one in the career of G. Bush as he must restore trust between R. Reagan and the European allies, a trust which has been lost after so many shocks," writes the paper IL GIORNO. Commenting on the tour by the U.S. vice president, the paper PAESE SERA points out that the majority of West European figures are observing White House policy with disappointment.

During his stay in Italy, G. Bush will meet with the leaders of the country and of the bourgeois parties, as well as the head of the Catholic Church. Concerning the attitude of Rome to the problem of medium-range missiles, local observers recall that Italy was the first to give consent to having them on its territory. "Our country has played a decisive role in NATO's adoption of a dual decision," LA REPUBBLICA writes.

However, if on a governmental level Italy remains one of the most reliable allies of Washington, the broad Italian public regards the prospect of the deployment of American nuclear missiles in their country in a different light. Every month the protest movement against the creation of a cruise missile base in Comiso (Sicily) broadens. Immense demonstrations, peace marches, the collection of signatures on petitions, symposiums and meetings of peace supporters -- these are the forms that the movement of peace-loving forces in Italy, including people of the most diverse political convictions, takes.

Local commentators note that Bush's visit to the Vatican will also be no simple tribute of politeness, taking into account that the church, above all in the United States itself, has recently joined the struggle for peace and disarmament. This is borne out in particular by the recent meeting in Rome of European and American clergymen at which the religious figures firmly came out in defense of peace.

"Special Place" on Itinerary

LD052327 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 5 Feb 83

[Text] The United States is continuing to insist on its zero option, which is currently being strongly publicized by Vice President Bush during his tour of Western Europe. He arrives in Italy today. We are going over to Rome. At the microphone is Valeriy Prostakov:

The visit to Rome occupies a special place in George Bush's tour of Western Europe. It is the most prolonged one; the American guest will stay in the Italian capital 4 days. The program for his visit to the Eternal City is also busier than those for the other West European capitals. It provides for meetings not only with the president, the prime minister and the minister of foreign affairs, but also with leaders of parties that are in the government. George Bush will also be received by the pope in the Vatican.

Local observers think he will meet with greater understanding in Rome than in Bonn, Hague, Brussels and Geneva. One cannot disagree with this. Italy is about the most faithful and obedient of the United States' partners. It is not by chance that the Italian Government was the first to agree, without any kind of conditions, to site U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles on its territory. Bases for the deployment of those missiles are already being built at Comiso in Sicily. As far as problems of limiting nuclear weapons in Europe are concerned, the Italian leaders adhere to the so-called zero option proposed by Reagan.

The U.S. vice president hopes to compensate in Rome for the obvious failure of his mission in the other capitals of Western Europe. As the press has noted, George Bush has been given a cold reception everywhere he has gone. He has not brought any new ideas or proposals to Western Europe which could move the talks in Geneva forward. His chief task is to distract the attention of the West European public from the new peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, using splendid words about the Washington administration's imaginary love of peace.

The U.S. President's letter to the peoples of Europe was supposed to be a trump card in this political game. But the card was beaten. Many newspapers in the West -- and in Italy as well -- agreed with the appraisal of the letter made by Comrade Andropov in his answers to a PRAVDA correspondent's questions. European doubts about the sincerity of Washington's assurances that it is interested in the earliest possible achievement of accord at the Geneva talks have only been reinforced. And however favorable for George Bush the atmosphere in the Italian corridors of power may be, his visit cannot suppress the waves of protest from the Italian public against the siting of U.S. cruise missiles in Comiso.

REAGAN 'JUGGLING', 'TWISTING' ECONOMIC STATISTICS

LD051612 Moscow TASS in English 1554 GMT 5 Feb 83

[Text] Washington February 5 TASS -- President Reagan has held a press conference at the White House timed for the publication of latest statistics on the employment situation in the United States. He attempted to use the official claims that the rate of unemployment dropped by 0.6 percent in January for publicity purposes, trying to augment his seriously impaired prestige inside country. The head of the U.S. Government claimed with affected optimism that the January data indicated a trend towards an improvement in the employment situation and a revival of the U.S. economy which is now in the grips of the severest crisis since the "Great Depression".

But the vocal publicity released by the White House is based on very unsteady ground -- namely, on juggling with and twisting statistics.

Ronald Reagan deliberately "forgot" to mention that the rate of joblessness in the United States traditionally falls insignificantly and temporarily in winter. He tried to present this purely seasonal phenomenon as if all the worst was now behind for the Americans. But, specialists note, the seeming reduction of unemployment in January is in fact explained, among other reasons, by the fact that shop owners fired less employees than usual because in the previous month they had hired less workers because of a lull in business connected with the Christmas and New Year holidays.

It is indicative that practically simultaneously with the press conference Ronald Reagan admitted in an interview with BUSINESS WEEK journal the country's difficult economic position and openly conceded that it would take at least another two years for his administration to produce any effect. He failed to give any coherent answer to a question asking why his administration's economic policy had not led to increased capital investments and production growth and what it was going to do to reduce unemployment. The one thing clear from his answer was that the millions of "redundant" Americans could not hope for aid from the White House. The President admitted that many of the dismissed steel makers and auto workers would perhaps never get their jobs.

TASS REPORTS REAGAN RADIO ADDRESS ON ECONOMY

LD052232 Moscow TASS in English 2228 GMT 5 Feb 83

[Text] Washington February 5 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutiy reports:

U.S. President Ronald Regan does not like the word "Reaganomics". He complained of it today in his regular address to Americans on the radio.

He said that the word "Reaganomics" could be heard ever more often. It is like a label for the U.S. economic program. It is especially depressing, he said, that it is used as a term for describing the thing that has ended in failure.

The dissatisfaction of the President is easy to understand. The term has really become popular in the U.S. as a synonym of the totally bankrupt social and political course of the U.S. Administration, which brought immeasurable suffering and privations to millions of Americans. For them the word has acquired obviously negative meaning and is even pronounced with hatred.

However, Reagan could hardly count on a different attitude to his political course, for it is the "Reaganomics", which gave priority to the build-up of U.S. military potential, which brought the country into the quagmire of the deepest economic crisis since the "Great Depression" of the thirties. In no more than two years of the present administration's holding office, the number of unemployed went up by about four million to reach, by official statistics alone, over 11 million.

Whole families of Americans, who just recently were well provided for, joined the enormous group of people living below the official "poverty level", the group whose strength today amounts to 32 million.

Dislikes Term 'Reaganomics'

LD062337 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1130 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] Washington, 6 Feb (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lyutiy reports:

U.S. President R. Reagan does not like the word "Reaganomics" one bit and the White House boss, speaking on radio, has told the Americans that. Recently, he stated, we have been hearing the word "Reaganomics" more and more often. It is like a label which has been hung on our economic program. I would never have used it but, to judge by all appearances, it will become part of our language for good. It is especially perturbing, the President said, that "Reaganomics" is used "to mean something which has failed."

In effect, this term has taken permanent root in the United States as a synonym of the completely bankrupt socioeconomic course of the administration which has brought untold suffering and deprivation to millions of Americans. This word was assumed a sharply negative and even hateful meaning on their lips.

What is more, the head of the administration must count on no other attitude to this policy. To be sure, it is nothing other than "Reaganomics" that has led the country into the jungle of an economic crisis unparalleled since the days of the "Great Depression" in the 1930's. In the more 2 years that the present government has been in power the number of unemployed people in the country has leapt by almost 4 million.

Whole families of Americans who until recently were quite well off have lost their jobs, home and means of survival and have gone to join the huge army of social outcasts living below the poverty line. There are already 32 million of these people in the country. The government has cut by many tens of million of dollars the most vital program of help to the poor, the homeless, the very old, the sick and other needy Americans. According to the draft federal budget for the financial year of 1984 it is planned to cut these areas of state expenditure by a further $40 billion. It is at this expense that an unprecedented militarist program for "rearming" America is being implemented and $1.6 trillion dollars will be spent on this program in the coming 5 years. It comes as no surprise that the unrestrained spiraling of unproductive military expenditue has come as an unbearable burden on the economy of the country since it has bled civil sectors of industry and raised federal budget deficits to unprecedented heights.

Even the President himself has had to recognize this indisputable fact. Our industry, he said, is working only at two thirds capacity. The government faces major deficits and bank interests rates are too high.

However, what means of solving the very serious economic problems did the President propose to the Americans? The same old thing -- the continuation of the already bankrupt economic course which, as the head of the administration has asserted, has allegedly already begun to extricate the country from protracted slump. Reagan did not blush to cite as "evidence" official "figures" on a reduction of 0.4 percent in unemployment in January. Moreover, as specialists point out, this sham "reduction" is explained by straightforward juggling of the statistics and also by certain seasonal factors. In acutal fact, as the NBC television company reported, referring to the Congress statistics service, the unemployment figure for January increased to 12.5 million. "The President, THE WASHINGTON POST writes in this connection, is being openly accused of attempting to present a feignedly optimistic picture of the economic situation in order to force Congress to make new reductions in federal programs.

The word "Reaganomics" will sound ever more frequently as an accusation of an inhuman policy which, Senator Edward Kennedy (a Democrat from Massachusetts) said, "causes pain to the majority." Addressing the National Committee of the Democratic Party, Kennedy said: In 1984 our reply to the Republicans will be the following: The problem of unemployment can be resolved only if the country sacks the present President."

Condemning the administration's course toward the unlimited escalation of military expenditure, the senator stressed the need to conclude a treaty with the Soviet Union on a mutual and verifiable freeze on production, testing and deployment of nuclear weapons.

Delivering an official response to Reagan's radio speech, Senator Carl Levin (a Democrat from Michigan) said: "Our people are suffering a great disaster, but the government does not react to this at all. The richest people in the country are granted excessive tax privileges, while the unemployed are forced to freeze in charitable soup lines."

TASS: VOICE OF AMERICA HEAD LAUNCHES NEW PURGE

LD070208 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1217 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] Washington, 6 Feb (TASS) -- A new 'purge' has been launched at the subversive "Voice of America' radio station, which is Washington's official mouthpiece. Its aim is to 'sharpen' the slanderous activity of the Voice of America and rid it of staff who, in the White House's view, do not manifest sufficient zeal in manufacturing the lies and disinformation emitted into the airwaves.

This time, THE WASHINGTON POST reports, the 'purge' is being conducted by the new director of Voice of America -- the third since the Reagan administration took office -- Kenneth Tomlinson, the former hack writer from the conservative magazine READERS' DIGEST. He receives his instructions on the efficient conduct of "witch hunts" from one Roy Cohn, who in his day was an assistant to the raving Senator McCarthy.

THE WASHINGTON POST notes that the morale of Voice of America staff is falling. People are being suddenly transferred from place to place and some have resigned in protest. One staff member, a survivor from the McCarthy period, admits that the last few months have been "worse than ever."

Ludicrous though the search for 'Reds' in the hornets' nest of professional anti-Sovietism may appear, it nonetheless corresponds to the instructions of head of the U.S. Information Agency (ISICA) Charles Wick, a close friend of President Reagan. Wick, whose domain includes the radio station, seriously thinks, as NEWSWEEK wrote, that "communists have probably penetrated the Voice of America."

This campaign, which borders on paranoid, can lead to only one thing: still further hardening the already slanderous activity of the Voice of America. It does not harm to recall that Wick's protege Philip Nicolaides, who until recently was in charge of the radio station, called on his staff to "forget that they had anything to do with journalism," and busy themselves with anti-Soviet activity alone.

SHULTZ WRAPS UP CHINA LEG OF FAR EAST TOUR

Talks End

LD050316 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 4 Feb 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Aleksandr Kaverznev]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State Shultz ends his talks with the Chinese leaders today. [Video shows Shultz descending from aircraft.] Tomorrow he will resume his tour around the Far East, during which he is yet to visit Seoul and Hong Kong. Today Shultz stated that he had managed to overcome friction in American-Chinese relations. [Video shows Shultz being met by PRC leader, cutting to shots of delegations at conference table.] Tension arose between the two countries due to the fact that the United States continues to deliver arms to Taiwan and as a result of the American strategy for the Far East, which puts Beijing on its guard.

Let me note that the Chinese side appraises the talks with Shultz in a considerably more restrained way than does the U.S. secretary of state.

Reagan Invitation Issued

LD061340 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0712 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] Beijing, 6 Feb (TASS) -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has ended his talks here with Deng Xiaoping, Zhao Ziyang, Foreign Minister Wu Xueqian and Defense Minister Zhang Aiping. XINHUA reports that the talks included discussion on the state of Sino-American relations and on issues pertaining to Taiwan. A number of international problems of mutual interest were reviewed as well as issues in Sino-Soviet and American-Soviet relations.

Zhao Ziyang, premier of the State Council, was given an invitation from President Reagan to visit the United States. It was accepted. The time of the trip will be agreed upon later.

In the course of discussing trade and economic links between the two countries, the Chinese side emphasized that the measures unilaterally adopted by the U.S. Government with the aim of limiting the export of Chinese textiles into the United States are not going to favorably affect the development of trade between China and the United States.

In Beijing, Shultz met with former Prince Sihanouk, head of the notorious "coalition" which was put together using the remnants of emigre Khmer reactionaries, including Pol Pot supporters, for the purpose of underming the revolutionary achievements of the Kampuchean people.

The U.S. secretary of state left Beijing today for a visit to South Korea.

Meeting With Sihanouk

LD050515 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 2010 GMT 4 Feb 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Aleksandr Kaverznev]

[Text] The second stage of U.S. Secretary of State Shultz' Far Eastern journey is ending. He has held talks in Beijing. The speeches and toasts that the guest and hosts exchanged in public abounded in platitudes on both sides and evasive formulations.

Shultz spoke of the great importance of his visit to him personally, for President Reagan and for the United States, which wants firm and stable relations with China, since Washington and Beijing have, as Shultz put it, parallel interests in the world.

The Chinese leaders also spoke of their sincere hope for good development of bilateral relations, but stressed much more insistently than Shultz that the negotiations must be frank and sober. [Video shows Shultz meeting Chinese leaders at a conference table,] In the words of Wu Xueqian, Chinese foreign minister, on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence, his country wishes to maintain and develop normal relations with all states. Specifically, with regard to the United States he said that difficulties and obstacles exist and effort is needed to drive away the dark clouds. From further reports it became clear that at issue was not only the problem of Taiwan, to which Washington continues to supply arms, but the Far East as a whole is disturbed by the whole U.S. strategy in the region.

As he flew from Tokyo to Beijing, with a frankness unusual for him Shultz told journalists in the airplane that he was ready to discuss the problem of American arms supplies to China if China asked about this. So far it is unknown whether China has asked, but Shultz' words have become well known: A visit by President Reagan to the PRC at the moment seems premature.

Turning to another mission that Shultz has taken on, in Beijing he met the former ruler of Kampuchea, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, who leads the so-called coalition of the reactionary Khmer emigration and surviving Pol Pot supporters and calls himself the president of some democratic Kampuchea. Sihanouk has just been in Thailand, where he visited a camp of Pol Pot supporters and demonstrated his unity with them, and now he is meeting Shultz. Well, the chain of logic is apparent. The central thing is not, of course, the personality of the prince, nor any sympathy for him felt by the secretary of state. U.S. sponsorship is calculated to lend authority, so to speak, to the coalition, which yearns to belong to the Nonaligned Movement -- the movement in which, by rights, a place should belong to the present legitimate Government of People's Kampuchea.

Incidentally, after the meeting with Shultz, Sihanouk yesterday published a statement in Beijing demanding that Vietnam be deprived of its place in the Nonaligned Movement.

Problems Remain

LD062148 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Feb 83

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin; item includes 10 seconds of video showing Shultz shaking hands with a Chinese official and sitting at a conference table]

[Text] Let us leave Tokyo together with Shultz and go to Beijing. There has still not been much snow there this winter, and while waiting for his American counterpart PRC Minister of Foreign Affairs Wy Xueqian said: It would be a good thing if Shultz were to bring not only new proposals from the U.S. Government, but also a good snowfall. That would be doubly pleasant.

At the moment it is difficult to judge the degree of pleasure the Chinese from their conversation with Shultz. He was extremely cautious, being aware of the rapt attention with which United States, and not only the States, is now following the state of Chinese-U.S. relations.

Shultz was seen off in America by a very loud chorus from all types of publication, whose main thought boiled down to the fact that in the sphere of Chinese-U.S. relations, the U.S. Administration has made many mistakes, and that these must be rectified.

Here, as an example of these publications, is a fairly interesting excerpt from a report by the Asian Studies Center of the conservative organization Heritage Foundation. The very title of the report is significant: The Chinese Card: A Winner or a Loser? Here is what was written: Shultz' visit to Beijing takes place at a critical stage in Chinese-U.S. relations. For more than a decade, those responsible for U.S. polices have been hypnotized, as it were, by the prospect of China becoming a colleague or a partner, or even an ally, in the global confrontation with the USSR. Nothing, the report asserts, has come of this.

This was followed by specific recommendations to Shultz, whose sense was the following: In Beijing Shultz should behave firmly. He should emphasize that however advantageous U.S. actions are for the PRC, or however much they correspond to the PRC's demands, they will only be considered in so far as the PRC itself takes steps with a direct and measurable advantage for the United States. Shultz is, in fact, being faced with the task, as people say here, or renewing strategic relations between the United States and the PRC.

Well, in principle there can of course, and should be, normal stable relations between such countries. So far however, the United States has approached China from anti-Soviet points of view alone. But now, when the general situation which is independent of the United States has begun to change, the question arises as to whether the Americans will be able to adapt to this new situation, or whether they will as before see China merely as a junior partner, and as a means of putting pressure on the USSR. It is difficult to answer these questions yet, but in general one gets the impression that although Shultz has left, the problems of Chinese-U.S. relations remain.

PRC DAILY WARNS U.S. ABOUT KOREAN 'PROVOCATIONS'

LD041626 Moscow TASS in English 1320 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Beijing February 4 TASS -- The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO writes in connection with the U.S.-South Korean exercise Team Spirit 83, which began in South Korea:

The Armed Forces of the United States and the puppet troops of South Korea are holding from February 1 to mid-April the biggest ever military exercise to cover the entire territory of South Korea. By their sabre-rattling the United States and the Chon Tu-Hwan clique are working up tension in the Korean Peninsula and causing serious damage to peace and security in North-East Asia.

The current, tense situation in the Korean peninsula, the paper says, has emerged because the Chon Tu-Hwan clique, refusing to participate in talks on a peaceful unification of Korea and supported by the U.S. Armed Forces, is building up its military power with an aim of preparing for war. Instead of pulling its troops out of South Korea, the United States is lifting large contingents of ground, naval and Air Force troops and huge quantities of modern weapons there from its own territory and bases in the Pacific.

By means of these measures the United States is not only undermining chances of Korea's peaceful unification and widening the split between the country's north and south parts, but also creating a grave threat to stability in the Korean peninsula. The Chinese people are vigorously opposing such impudent U.S. actions.

China, RENMIN RIBAO says, is strongly demanding that the United States should immediately stop its armed provocations against the northern part of Korea. Otherwise the United States will bear full responsibility for all the entailing, serious consequences.

REPORTAGE ON SHULTZ VISIT TO SOUTH KOREA

Arrives Amid 'Growth of Tension'

LD061007 Moscow TASS in English 0857 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] Tokyo February 6 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, on a tour of Asian nations, arrived in Seoul today, KYODO TSUSHIN news agency reports. He will discuss during his talks with leaders of the South Korean junta questions of expanding American aid to the repressive South Korean dictatorship. Shultz's visit, the newspaper ASAHI writes, is taking place in an atmosphere of an unprecedented growth of tension in the Korean Peninsula, brought about, in particular, by the current large-scale U.S.-South Korean military exercises Team Spirit '83 involving more than 190,000 officers and men of the United States and South Korea.

Commitment to S. Korea

LD061928 Moscow World Service in English 1700 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] Secretary of State Shultz has said in Seoul the aim of his visit is demonstrating the United States' unshakeable commitment to South Korea. Besides meetings with Seoul regime leaders, State Secretary Shultz, clad in a military uniform, will visit American troops that were stationed along the demilitarized zone. The secretary of state is visiting South Korea at a time when unheard-of in scale war games are on. The Team Spirit exercises are aimed at drilling troops in waging a war on the Korean Peninsula.

Shultz on Team Spirit-83

SK070747 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] In his statement issued today in Seoul, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz said: I have come here for the purpose of (?demonstrating) the firm and unwavering U.S. (?duty) to South Korea.

On top of his meetings with the bosses of the Seoul regime, Shultz will inspect U.S. forces deployed along the demilitarized zone.

The visit to South Korea by the U.S. secretary of state is timed with the staging of the large-scale military exercise called Team Spirit '83, which is aimed at rehearsing war on the Korean peninsula.

This exercise is being participated in by some 200,000 U.S. troops and men and officers of the South Korean Armed Forces and these soldiers are using mock nuclear and chemical weapons.

SOUTH ASIA

DRA MILITARY DELEGATION VISITS MOSCOW

Arrival 4 Feb

LD041938 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Lieutenant General 'Abdol Qader, candidate member of PDPA Central Committee Politburo and minister of national defense of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, arrived in Moscow today on an official visit at the invitation of Comrade Ustinov, marshal of the Soviet Union, Politburo member of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of defense of the USSR.

He was met at the airport by Comrade Ustinov; Marshal of the Soviet Union Comrade Sokolov, first deputy minister of defense of the USSR; Army General Comrade Yepishev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army; deputy ministers of defense of the USSR; and other officials. Also among the welcoming party was Afghanistan's ambassador to the USSR.

Ustinov, Qader Meeting

LD051134 Moscow TASS in English 1104 GMT 5 Feb 83

[Text] Moscow February 5 TASS -- There was a meeting here today between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Defence Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Ustinov, and alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Minister of National Defence of the Democractic Republic of Afghanistan Lieutenant General 'Abdol Qader. He arrived in Moscow for an official visit on February 4.

Matters of mutual interest were discussed during the friendly conversation.

RADIO DEFENDS SOVIET POSITION ON AFGHANISTAN

OW070552 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1100 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Mitin and (Luben) commentary]

[Excerpts] Today we will talk about how world anti-Soviet elements comment on the Soviet Union's action in Afghanistan. In its recent article, a foreign magazine notorious for its anti-Soviet stance openly alleged that the Soviet Union militarily occupies Afghanistan so as to militarily and politically control that Asian country. Our station commentators Mitin and (Luben) have the following to say on this question:

First of all, it should be pointed out that the comments made by anti-Soviet elements abroad today on the Soviet policy on Afghanistan are nothing new. Does it mean that people are fed up yet with the thesis that the Soviet Union is occupying and ruling Afghanistan? No, what we mean here is not this. What we mean is that militarists repeatedly raised a hue and cry a long time ago about the Soviet Union occupying a certain country. As early as the days shortly after the victory of the October Revolution, enemies of our country raised a hullabaloo for the first time that the Soviet Union had ambitions for hegemony.

The Chinese listeners may understand this better if I explain this question by citing the case of China, for example. When the Chinese revolutionary forces launched a struggle against reactionaries at home and abroad in the 1920's, the Soviet Union supplied them with extensive military aid.

At the request of Sun Yat-sen, the Soviet Government dispatched a number of experienced military generals to China to take part in the National Revolutionary Army's operational preparations and actual fighting. Soviet weapons were extensively used in these campaigns. This example is very appropriate.

It is no wonder that imperialism hated the Soviet Union's internationalist action to the very marrow of its bones. At that time, headlines such as "Bolsheviks Militarily Interfere With China" and "Russians Want To Rule China" repeatedly appeared in U.S., British and Japanese newspapers. Reactionaries of all countries repeatedly rang the alarm bell, using Soviet "aggression" to scare the people.

The fundamental differences between reactionaries and revolutionaries and the tit-for-tat stand they take are also prominently manifested on the Afghanistan issue. At the request of the Afghan Government and in line with the guidelines of the Soviet-Afghan treaty, the Soviet Union dispatched a limited number of troops to Afghanistan to help fight against foreign aggression and defend the fruits of revolution, thereby fulfilling its internationalist commitment.

It is noteworthy that unlike some of their accomplices, the imperialists do not regard Soviet actions in Afghanistan as evidence of our country's becoming a so-called superpower. The imperialists are not interested in this way of speaking. In their opinion, Soviet actions, whether past or present, are all determined by the socialist system and by the Soviet Union's consistent loyalty to the revolutionary cause. Though the imperialists and their accomplices interpret the Soviet Union's policy on Afghanistan differently, the essence of the question remains the same. Both the imperialists, who call Soviet policy on Afghanistan a communist menace, and their accomplices, who call Soviet actions "big power hegemonism," are all opposing the socialist force and defending their own interests.

U.S. AID TO 'AFGHAN COUNTERREVOLUTION' VIEWED

LD041653 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1538 GMT 4 Feb 83

["Behind the Scenes of the Undeclared War" -- TASS Headline]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Feb (TASS) -- TASS political observer Askold Biryukov writes:

The U.S. President took new action the other day that certainly will not add to the laurels of the American Administration. In the White House he received, or more exactly, lavished kindness on a group from the so-called "Afghan freedom fighters," or, more to the point, hired terrorists by whose hands an undeclared war is being waged against the DRA. He lavished kindness and, judging by the reports, yet again promised Washington's aid and support for the Afghan counterrevolution if it continues the struggle against people's power in Afghanistan and uses every means to hinder the process of revolutionary transformation that is gaining strength in the country in the interests of the broad masses of the Afghan people.

Often, very often, Washington has been returning to the question of aid to the Afghan counterrevolution, which has settled itself outside the borders of the DRA. Literally on the eve of the New Year, R. Reagan came out with a statement on Afghanistan in which he praised the basmaks to the skies, and promised not to forget these "valiant people" or leave them to the mercy of fate.

The President's statement was preceded by the proposal in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress of unprecedently cynical anti-Afghan resolutions calling for "material aid" and "support" for the enemies of the DRA to be legalized and put on a broader footing.

Senator Paul Tsongas of Massachusetts said outright at one press conference that the United States should openly supply arms to the Afghan "freedom fighters." His remarks were amplified by Mohammad Yusuf, a chief of the counterrevolutionary emigres, who explained where the money collected for this purpose from the U.S. taxpayer would go. In Afghanistan, this "fighter for the faith" revealed in an outburst of frankness, we are defending the interests of the West, and above all "the interests and values of the United States." In defending those interests, he said, the "freedom fighters" have a right to increased American aid.

It is not fortuitous that beneath the vaulted ceilings of the Capitol, congressmen's voices have been heard exclaiming that the struggle of these "freedom fighters" must be given every support, and that they should be supplied with whatever quantity of arms the United States may "consider necessary" to ensure the "effectiveness" of the struggle against the April Revolution in Afghanistan, since that struggle "is, in the deepest sense of the word, our struggle too."

It should be noted that Washington for a long time has not spared resources "in defense of the interests and values of the West" and primarily of the United States in this region, which do not have any relation to the genuine interests and hopes of the Afghan people. According to foreign press reports, the United States has already allocated over $200 million for subversive activity against the DRA. Under pressure from Washington, the U.S. allies in military-political blocs and alliances have also paid out to support the Afghan counterrevolution. For example, the [British] Tory government allocated 17.5 million pounds sterling for these aims. However, the actions of the "freedom fighters" for some reason are not providing that "effectiveness" in the undeclared war against the DRA which Washington is interested in. It is not for want of weapons for the bandits or want of special camps where future cutthroats and hired killers are trained by the thousands and then sent into the DRA to carry out terrorist and subversive acts. It is not for the lack of powerful radio transmitters under the control of the organizer and coordinator of the undelcared war -- the U.S. CIA -- conducting real psychological warfare against Afghanistan.

All this and much else exists and is being done on an extensive scale. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, for instance, even the flow of instruments to the Pakistan-Afghanistan border for diversionary acts and killings has increased two to three times over the past year. Moreover, the counterrevolutionary bandits have never before possessed such a variety of arms. Nevertheless, the desired end result, the overthrow of people's rule and the triumph of freedom for its enemies [as received] and "the defenders of Western interests," will not be achieved.

What is more, with every passing day of the new life in Afghanistan the authority of people's power is mounting throughout the country and trust is broadening in the socioeconomic transformations that it is pursuing in the interests of the broad masses.

On the other hand, however, the organizers and the undelcared war against the DRA are increasingly dogged by military failures. The raids by armed formations sent by them into Afghanistan, mainly from Pakistan, more and more frequently end in their being routed.

The bandits are losing the ground under their feet. Even in the most remote settlements the Afghans are beginning to understand more and more who their real friends are and who their enemies are. Life itself delimits these concepts: who delivered bread, salt, matches and other essential supplies to the inhabitants of those "godforsaken" settlements in winter, in spite of enormous difficulties and obstacles, and who took away their last possessions; who built a bridge across a mountain stream and established a reliable link with life elsewhere, and who blew it up; who gave them equipment, seeds, and fertilizer for soil tillage and sowing, and who burnt the standing harvest.

Even among those who still have not completely understood, those who have been unable as yet to break free from their prejudices, a mass of questions arise -- again not favorable to the counterrevolution: Why was a teacher killed and a school burnt (1,812 schools have been burnt down in the country), in which their children -- the children of illiterates -- were acquiring all-powerful knowledge; why did the "fighters for the faith" kill their mullah, while the people's power provided money for the restoration of a mosque destroyed by the bandits; why did the new authorities give land and water to those who had always been landless, while the "freedom fighters" cut the irrigation ditches along which life-giving moisture reached their plots? They have many more questions.

By merely glancing at the bourgeois press or listening to the utterances of certain official leaders in the West one can easily detect barely concealed anxiety at the way the situation is developing in and around Afghanistan. Time advances inexorably. People's power is spreading its influence. In the camp of the counterrevolution -- no matter what efforts are made to feed and support it -- disunity is rife. Blinded by class hatred toward revolutionary transformations in the DRA, these adventurers are at each others throats to secure handouts from the West; they seek to make a profit; they pocket the so-called "humanitarian aid" which is being sent for their countrymen who have found themselves on Pakistani territory for various reasons.

Even the authors of the slanderous report on the situation in Afghanistan published at the end of last year by the U.S. State Department admit with open irritation that "the movement" of the Afghan counterrevolution "remains politically weak." They find a "pernicious hostility" among the various counterrevolutionary groups. "Leaders and organizations (of counterrevolutionaries -- A.B.) based in Peshawar (Pakistan) are split," the report says.

No less eloquent are the admissions by journalists of the Western press. In a December issue of the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, (Arnaut van Linden) writes about fierce disagreements and "distrust bordering on hatred" which rend the counterrevolutionaries. At the same time he notes that these manifestations are caused not at all by ideological disagreements but by the personal ambitions of the leaders, the striving to spread their authority to some region or other, and so on. He points out that this is particularly characteristic of the leaders of the Afghan counterrevolution based in Peshawar. The writer cites facts wherein "strugglers for the faith" from various groupings wage armed struggle against each other on the territory of the DRA and take turns at robbing the inhabitants of villages; that is, they engage in the most real banditry. Nor do they behave any better in Pakistan. The local population not only does not support the Afghan bandits and their leaders but even asks the central authorities to protect them from the arbitrariness of the basmaks.

(Radjan Gupta), a correspondent of THE INDIAN EXPRESS, writes that "the leaders of the rebels operating from the territory of Pakistan are interested in personal enrichment," that they have "no unified aim," and that they have "lost ideological and religious motives and are engaged in ordinary banditry."

The irreversible processes of strengthening the people's power now taking place in Afghanistan evidently seriously worry the organizers and inspirers of the undeclared war against Afghanistan and their accomplices. Not a month goes by without some major Western figure of state visiting the Afghan counterrevolutionary camp in Peshawar, appealing to the bandits to continue or step up their "resistance struggle" in Afghanistan, and promising more millions of dollars, pounds sterling, or other currency for their "sacred cause." In the period since last fall alone, (Yoshio Sakurauchi), former foreign minister of Japan, (F. Gutman), secretary general at the French Ministry of External Relations, L. Eagleburger, U.S. undersecretary for political affairs, W.F. Smith, U.S. attorney general, and D. Hurd, British minister of state at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, have visited Pakistan with such missions. The last of these openly declared: "It is quite right that the armed struggle in Afghanistan should continue."

This more or less open activity and the clandestine operations, shrouded in secrecy, which the United States and its associates are waging, form a pattern of attempts (for the umpteenth time!) to unite diverse groupings of Afghan counterrevolution with a view to improving the system of coordination and control of the armed gangs and creating an organizational basis for expansion of military and financial aid to the counterrevolution. What is at stake is an attempt to establish tougher control over the groupings of Afghan counterrevolutionary emigres, now in a state of crisis, for the sake of and with a view to continuing and extending aggression against the DRA. In order to achieve this objective use is being made not only of the trips to counterrevolutionary camps by American and other Western emissaries, as well as public assurances of support for the "sacred cause" of counterrevolution. Behind the scenes methods of pressurising leaders of Afghan emigres, involving bribery and blackmail, threats of depriving them of "assistance," and so on, have also been launched.

These and other facts reveal the genuine intentions of the United States and of those who follow in their wake. They testify that Washington is interested not in a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan but in the continuation of undeclared war against the DRA and interference in the internal affairs of the nations of that region.

DRA TROOPS ROUT 'COUNTERREVOLUTIONARIES'

LD031332 Moscow TASS in English 1043 GMT 3 Feb 83

[Text] Kabul February 3 TASS -- A brigade of the frontier troops of the Armed Forces of Afghanistan has carried out a successful operation in Badakhshan Province and routed a gang of mercenaries, who had been sent from Pakistan for subversive activities in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Six bandits have been taken prisoner.

Another gang of counter-revolutionaries has been routed in Qonduz Province with the support of the local population. Large quantities of arms, including submachine guns, grenade launchers and three trucks have been captured, the BAKHTAR agency said.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA REVIEWS SITUATION IN AFGHANISTAN

PM031629 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Feb 83 First Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov "International Notes": "Friends and Enemies of Afghanistan"]

[Text] Today the Afghan people are employed in creative labor. Land and water reform -- the age-old dream of the Afghan peasantry -- is being implemented in the country; industrialization plans are being carried out; the organizational structure of the central and local authorities is being improved and strengthened. Objective eyewitnesses from the West who visit Democratic Afghanistan also write of these positive changes. Thus, on his return from Afghanistan British Member of Parliament R. Brown published a long article in the London magazine (?STRAIGHT LEFT). In it he points out: "The people of Afghanistan are building a new life purposefully and with great enthusiasm and energy; they are surmounting obstacles. The reforms being implemented as a result of the 1978 revolution have been an important step for the whole of the Near and Middle East."

But it must be pointed out that the pace of Afghanistan's economic revival and the growth in the well-being of its people's masses could be higher if the Afghans' creative labor were not hampered by the criminal activity of the counterrevolution operating from abroad. At the same time, it has long been an open secret that Washington is the inspirer and organizer of the "undeclared war" being waged against the DRA.

It is with Amer. .n money that approximately 80 special bases and camps have been set up and are operating in Pakistan, where anti-Afghan bandit gangs are trained and formed before being infiltrated onto Afghan territory. American instructors teach the basmak a full course in the science of killing, and the weapons which they receive before being sent off are also American.

Giving the Afghan dushmans all possible support, Washington tries in vain to depict them as some sort of "freedom fighters" and "for the purity of Islam." But all this is just words. The gang members are hired cutthroats. They receive payment according to a fixed rate for every action they commit in Afghanistan -- whether it be a school burned down or a teacher tortured, a bakery destroyed or a mullah killed for daring to condemn the bandits' atrocities, a well poisoned or a bus blown up with schoolchildren on board. So it is certainly not any ideals but real, ready money, in hard currency, that interests and inspires the killers, and the bosses are not stingy.

Of course, Washington and other Western capitals must know this. Nevertheless, they generously continue to place multimillion-dollar sums at the disposal of the leaders of the Afghan counterrevolution. Recently U.S. President Reagan openly declared that his administration will continue the "undeclared war" against Afghanistan. Addressing the hired bandits, the master of the White House promised to continue giving them all "necessary assistance." Commenting on Reagan's statement, THE LOS ANGELES TIMES rightly pointed out that without this assistance the bandits who are endeavoring to reverse Afghanistan's development would not hold out for more than a few weeks.

This is true. As the population feels the beneficial influence of the reforms being carried out under the PDPA's leadership, the authority of the people's power strengthens, and the base of the subversive activity of the counterrevolutionary gangs continuously contracts. The terrorists are increasingly frequently meeting with an organized rebuff from self-defense detachments not only in the cities but also in many villages. Hundreds of families lured abroad by deception and threats are returning home. Therefore, DRA Prime Minister S.A. Keshtmand is quite right to declare in an interview with a correspondent of the Indian newspaper PATRIOT that "the bandits' isolation from the people is increasing as more and more people begin to realize who their real friends are and who their enemies are, to realize that the policy of the DRA Government and the PDPA accords with their vital interests, and that counterrevolutionaries are nothing but inveterate robbers and terrorists."

Thus, it may be stated most clearly that it is precisely the constant armed sallies against the DRA committed by counterrevolutionary gangs from abroad that are the chief cause complicating the situation both in and around Afghanistan. This was bluntly pointed out by DRA Foreign Minister S.M. Dost in an interview for the magazine NEW WORLD REVIEW, which is published in New York. "We have repeatedly declared," he also said, "that we want to live in peace and to maintain normal, good relations with all countries, including the United States. However, our efforts in this direction are one-sided -- we have still not received a positive response to our proposals."

As for the Soviet Union's policy on this question, it is clear and consistent. The USSR fully supports the DRA Government's constructive stand. Our country, like the other socialist countries, advocates a peaceful political settlement of the situation over Afghanistan on the basis of the full and unconditional cessation and the guaranteed nonresumption of armed or any other interference in its affairs, and the normalization of relations between Afghanistan and its neighbors.

There is no other way but talks to ease tension in Southeast Asia.

FORMATION OF DRA VOLUNTEER CORPS REPORTED

LD031712 Moscow TASS in English 1005 GMT 3 Feb 83

[Text] Kabul February 3 TASS -- The wide masses of the working people of Afghanistan actively come out in defence of the gains of the April Revolution. This is particularly vividly seen from the growth of the number of people's volunteer corps detachments repelling the brigand attacks of counter-revolutionary gangs sent from Pakistan to mills and factories, institutions, schools and hospitals.

Presently, as the newspaper HAQIQAT-E ENQELAB-E SAWR reported, more than a thousand detachments for the defence of the revolution joining tens of thousands people -- workers, peasants, handicraftsmen and students -- have been formed.

An overwhelming majority of the defenders of the revolution are the peasants, whom the revolution has given land and water. Characteristically, 99 per cent of representatives of the progressive peasantry, who joined the ranks of the defenders of the revolution, are simultaneously members of cooperatives, which were set up by them on the lands received from the state.

DYMSHITS ATTENDS MEETING TO MARK INDIAN HOLIDAY

PM031443 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Holiday Marked"]

[Text] The further consolidation of Soviet-Indian friendship is in the interests of the peoples of both countries and in the interests of consolidating peace and international security. This was pointed out at a ceremonial meeting of representatives of Moscow's public held on 25 January to mark India's national holiday -- Republic Day.

The keynote speaker -- USSR Minister N.V. Goldin, president of the Soviet-Indian Friendship Society -- stressed that the comprehensive ties between the two countries have successfully developed year after year on the basis of the firm foundation of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation.

Addressing the meeting, V.K. Ahuja, Indian ambassador to the USSR, described the relations between India and the Soviet Union as a model of peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous cooperation. He congratulated activists of the Soviet-Indian Friendship Society on its jubilee -- 25 years of fruitful work.

A salutatory address to those present was delivered by professor (G. Prasad), head of an Indian-Soviet Cultural Society delegation.

Taking part in the ceremony were S.N. Imashev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and V.E. Dymshits, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

WEST EUROPEAN REACTION TO REAGAN LETTER NOTED

LD042345 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 4 Feb 83

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Kaverznev]

[Text] Good evening, comrades. In West Europe passions are now aroused over the problems of reduction of nuclear medium-range means. The discussions did not start yesterday and will not end tomorrow. Not for nothing has this year been dubbed missile year by the quick-witted American newsmen, who recall the NATO plans. At any rate, this week discussions acquired unusual scope after the replies by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov to PRAVDA concerning the Reagan message to the peoples of Europe. Today many statements have come in in favor of the Soviet position. We regularly tell you about them. There is an increase in the number of West Europeans, including influential politicians, who upon reflection agree that Reagan proposed nothing but a load of phrases, that his reproaches to the Soviet Union are unjustified, and that there is no seriousness in the proposal for an immediate meeting with the leader of our party to sign an agreement absolutely unacceptable to the USSR.

What else is there to argue about, one might think. The American Administration would do well, instead of engaging in distortion, to take a serious look at our ideas or offer us and West Europe their own constructive solutions. But in Washington they have a different understanding of what they now call the psychological battle for the cold hearts and minds of Europeans. I do not know whether you have ever considered how the head of the White House, who occupies one of the most responsible posts in the modern world, could have so lightly cast his authority on the scales and loudly proclaimed to Europe such an essentially insubstantial message. What is it: a mistake, naive miscalculation? No. Here was a quite definite character and way of thinking at work.

I have kept excerpts from THE NEW YORK TIMES' New Year's Eve article. I quote: Reagan and his advisers are turning to new subjects in relations with the public to create the sensation of movement and to reassure the dissatisfied. It goes on to quote the words of a White House spokesman: In our political difficulties there is nothing that cannot be solved -- boosting the economy and arms agreement with the Soviet Union. Franklin Roosevelt remained popular because he was a pragmatist ready to try new measures. That is the kind of impression we must create ourselves.

Three weeks or so later, in the same spirit THE BOSTON GLOBE said: The White House is looking for something with which to recapture the imagination of the people.

Have you noticed? Sensation, impression, imagination, -- the game is consciously being played on a low level. On one there is a real U.S. rearmament; on another there are talks on reduction of armaments; and on the third there is the psychological war for hearts and minds with the help of arguments having nothing in common with reality.

Not long before the arrival in Europe of U.S. Vice President Bush, if you remember, reports appeared in the West on the allocation of millions to professional advertising agencies to look for trenchant slogans in support of Reagan's false zero option. This is not the invention of idle reporters, it is a fact. Now in West Berlin Bush, before the TV cameras, surprising everyone, takes out of his pocket the message from his President addressed no more and no less than to the peoples of all Europe -- in itself, an excellent advertising gesture capable of striking the imagination. Then Bush proclaims the skillfully worded phrase -- the chief one in the message -- to ban throughout the globe intermediate-range land-based nuclear weapons.

Now imagine the reaction of West Europeans on hearing this at a cafe table or in a pub: Good old Reagan, well done!

The calculations of the advertisers is simple: Nagged, frightened by militant propanganda, not very well versed in all the crafty political ins-and-outs, the European man in the street will simply pay no attention to the words "land-based." Something else will stick in the memory -- "ban throughout the world." The swindled customer gets the naive idea: But that cannot be bad, to begin with, to ban everywhere one type of weapon and then perhaps another. For the West European another attractive thing is the fact that instead of the usual term "medium-range nuclear means," Reagan says "intermediate range." What is the span [promezhutok] here? Well it is easiest to imagine that it is Europe, lying between the United States and the Soviet Union. Simpleminded people have to learn and think a lot more to get at the truth. Reagan is like a man who has gathered stones against his neighbor defending himself with a fence and who for the sake of peace proposes now that all the fences be taken down leaving the stones.

It has come about historically that land-based facilities have become the nucleus of our defense, while their aggressive might is founded on air and submarine missile carriers. What are we supposed to do now -- disarm ourselves unilaterally? This will never be, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov stressed, and our people undividedly support this position.

The cunning and cynicism of the Washington administrators is obvious and staggering. Their attempts to treat the Europeans as simpletons are also staggering. However, out of some incomprehensible sense of solidarity with Bush during his tour of seven states of West Europe, in some places he is being played up to considerably. He has been supported by FRG Chancellor Kohl. In Belgium Minister of External Affairs Tindemans, receiving Bush, voiced the opinion that his country is ready to accept the American cruise missiles if the talks in Geneva do not produce any result. Nevertheless, in Brussels a final decision has not yet been taken. Parliament is resisting, as are the public. But the Western press is presenting the statement by Tindemans as the outcome of his talks with Bush -- spectacular, and flattering for the American vice president. And yet, observing the reaction of the West European public, one comes to the conclusion that Bush will not achieve the chief aim of his mission. He will not convince people of the love of peace and good will of the Reagan administration. The false deductions and distortion of the Reagan zero option inevitably crumble to dust and will not stand up against the concrete and realistic Soviet proposals.

AUSTRIAN CHANCELLOR IN UNITED STATES FOR TALKS

'A Time of Aggravation'

LD041800 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0930 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Washington, 4 Feb (TASS) -- Correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov reports:

[Talks have taken place in the White House between President R. Reagan and Austrian Federal Chancellor B. Kreisky, who is here on an official visit.

As observers are noting, B. Kreisky's visit to the United States comes at a time of aggravation in relations between the United States and Austria. Washington is annoyed that Austria, in conducting a policy of neutrality, is developing trade and economic cooperation with the USSR and the other socialist countries, and is resolutely condemning Israel's aggressive policy, which is supported by the United States. The arms race, which has become intensified through the fault of the administration, the dangerous militarist preparations being undertaken by Washington and the bellicose calls emanating from there are also causing serious alarm in Austria.

At the talks in the White House, pressure was put on the federal chancellor with the aim of forcing him to alter his tried and tested foreign policy, particularly the development of mutually advantageous trade and economic ties with the Soviet Union.

At a meeting with journalists after the talks, a high-ranking representative of the U.S. Administration stated bluntly that B. Kreisky had been asked to "harden" his policy in this matter. According to an AP report, demands are being heard in Washington to resort to the "tested weapon" against Austria -- imposing trade "sanctions" on it if it refuses to go along with the United States.

However, the attempts to pressure the Austrian chancellor evidently did not succeed. Speaking at press converence after the talks, B. Kreisky stressed that trade with the Soviet Union is purely Austria's domestic concern.

The chancellor noted that persistent demands are being heard in all the countries of Western Europe to hold "very serious talks" on questions of arms control which "would avert the rearmament" of the European Continent. He emphasized that there has never before been such a powerful peace movement in Western Europe.

Judging from the pronouncements by American officials, considerable attention at the talks was devoted to economic problems as well. The Austrian leader pointed out that the deep economic crisis in the United States is having an extremely unfavorable effect on the world economy, including Austria's. The sides failed to reach a common opinion on this question. As expected, the American side according to B. Kreisky, expressed "optimism" over the prospects of "improving" the U.S. economy. In Europe, however, he stressed, they do not share this optimism.

Kreisky Remarks Cited

LD042340 Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Washington February 4 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lutiy reports:

Austrian Federal Chancellor Bruno Kreisky, who is currently on a visit here, declared in favor of development of mutually beneficial East-West political and trade-economic cooperation.

Speaking at the National Press Club in Washington today, he pointed out that the fruit of such a cooperation are very well seen from Austria's example. Our country, Bruno Kreisky stressed, maintains good relations with the socialist states. We are convinced that this is the right policy, albeit the United States calls such a stand in question. We have very few problems in our relations with the Soviet Union, he said.

The distinguished Austrian guest has criticised Washington's attempts at bringing pressure to bear on Austria with the aim of making it give up trade cooperation with the USSR and the other socialist countries. Only the Austrian, and no other government, may decide questions of Austria's trade with other states.

A "very serious and deep-going" public movement against the threat of nuclear war has unfolded in Western Europe, the federal chancellor said. A distinctive feature of that movement, he noted, is the unprecedented political activeness of young people. Never before, Bruno Kreisky stressed, have we witnessed such a powerful movement of West European youth in defence of peace.

Noting that the Reagan administration should heed the demands of the West European public, the federal chancellor urged official Washington to hold serious talks with the Soviet Union on problems of limitation of the arms race.

IZVESTIYA 'REJOINDER' CRITICIZES AUSTRIAN RADIO

LD062028 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] Moscow February 6 TASS -- Newspaper IZVESTIYA today came forward with a rejoinder in which it rejects the arguments of those who come out "in defence of" P. Lendvai and B. Coudenhowe-Kalergi, staff members of the Austrian Radio and Television (ORF) who compiled slanderous reportages in which the true picture of life in the USSR, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia is distorted.

After the publication of IZVESTIYA's recent article which exposed the slanderers, the newspaper points out, "some of the high-ranking officials in the Austrian capital, apparently without quite gaining an understanding of the essence of the matter of for some other situation-determined considerations far from the truth, took under protection P. Lendvai and B. Coudenhoue-Kalergi who specialise in hostile pronouncements against socialist countries. The Final Act of the European conference, as is known, recommends something different -- to strengthen the spirit of mutual understanding and well-wishing between peoples.

In Austria, the newspaper goes on, there were voices that argued that IZVESTIYA's article "burdens" Soviet-Austrian relations. However, is not it clear that the care for objectivity and honesty of information, and decency of journalists can in no way darken good relations. It is precisely the stirring up of animosity and distrust between peoples, which the compilers of the ORF "Eastern Bureau" practise, that can burden them.

VOLKSTIMME, newspaper of the Austrian Communists, in its leading article notes the untenability of allusions to the "freedom of the press", to which some leaders of the ORF and those who try to shelter P. Lendvai and B. Coudenhoue-Kalergi resort. The activity of the "Eastern Bureau", VOLKSTIMME points out, was justly criticised in IZVESTIYA. "That was not some superficial criticism," VOLKSTIMME writes. IZVESTIYA's article gives concrete examples of broadcasts created by the 'bureau'. The Soviet newspaper rightfully describes them as subversive ideological activity and anti-communist concoction."

AUCCTU DELEGATION ENDS TALKS IN FRANCE

LD042350 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Paris, 4 Feb (TASS) -- Talks between a Soviet trade union delegation and the leadership of the French General Labour Confederation (CGT), at which questions of bilateral cooperation and problems concerning the international trade union movement were discussed, ended here today. The leader of the Soviet delegation, AUCCTU Chairman Stepan Shalayev, and the CGT general secretary, Henri Krasucki, signed a joint statement and an agreement on cooperation between the CGT and the AUCCTU.

The statement says that the sides noted "a coincidence of views on the role and place of trade unions in public life, and adopted a decision to give cooperation between the CGT and the AUCCTU a more concrete nature and bring it closer to the real life of enterprises in order to be better acquainted with each other's experience and with prospects for development."

The trade union movement in Europe, the joint statement stresses, can play "a paramount role in creating conditions more favorable to the cause of peace and peaceful coexistence."

"Both organizations oppose the imperialist arms race policy imposed by the U.S. Government," the statement says. "They actively support the people's movement which has sprung up in Europe, and in many countries around the world, the aim of which is to put an end to the arms race policy and attain universally-controlled disarmament."

FRENCH PRESIDENT RECEIVES NEW SOVIET AMBASSADOR

LD032142 Moscow TASS in English 2104 GMT 3 Feb 83

[Text] Paris February 3 TASS — I have a chance today to praise long-established friendship between our two peoples and stress the special importance I attach to relations between the Soviet Union and France, President Francois Mitterrand of France declared today at an Elysee Palace ceremony at which Yuliy Vorontsov, the USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to France, presented his credentials. The president voiced, in particular, a desire that economic and cultural relations between the two countries develop and reach a higher level.

There are numerous issues of mutual interest which can be examined in the most favourable spirit, he said. The most important of them is defence of peace and security of our countries. That is why I wish that the Geneva talks end in success and that a conference on disarmament in Europe take place.

Presenting his credentials, the new Soviet ambassador pointed out that the line towards all-round development of good relations with France is a long-term course which the Soviet leadership consistently follows. Joint efforts by such large states, as France and the Soviet Union, who were initiators of the favourable process of detente, could make serious contribution to lessening the existing international tension, consolidating peace and security. We proceed from the premise that there is now no task more important than struggle for peace, for the removal of the war menace, and for disarmament.

PORTUGUESE GOVERNMENT, U.S. TO NEGOTIATE ON BASES

LD021644 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 2 Feb 83

[Text] Madrid February 2 TASS — The government of right-wing parties, led by F. Pinto Balsemao, has announced talks with the United States on the conclusions of a new agreement on renting Portugal's Lajes airbase on the Azores, as one of its main tasks. According to an EFE report from Lisbon, this was told to the head of state E. Ramalho Eanes by the Cabinet which resigned towards the end of last year and which is to manage current affairs only until the pre-term parliamentary elections.

In their reports from Lisbon observers say that the outgoing government is hurrying to settle the question of Lajes base in order to put the future government before an accomplished fact. To judge by the results of the December 12 municipal elections, the Democratic Alliance, the ruling bloc of right-wing parties, has no broad support among the electorate now.

The EFE news agency says that Washington's representatives at the American-Portuguese talks, which have been going on since the end of last year, seek not only the prolongation of its agreement with Lisbon concerning the lease of the base, but also hope to gain access to military installations in the continental part of Portugal, specifically the airbase at Beja, 200 kilometres to the south of Lisbon.

What the Pentagon wants is to draw Portugal deeper into its military preparations. Without waiting for the conclusion of Portuguese-American talks, the USA is taking steps to modernize and enlarge the Lajes base. The Portuguese press says that about 70 million dollars are to be allocated for the purpose under the new American military budget.

COMMENTATOR INTERVIEWS EGYPTIAN POLITICIANS

PM031005 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jan 83 p 10

[Igor Belyayev article under "Cairo Dialogue" rubric "Egypt — Land of Marvels"]

[Excerpts] Moscow-Cairo-Moscow [no date given] — Once I was listening to the Egyptian popular song "Take Me Back to Cairo." It was being performed by a young singer on the banks of the Nile. His smile, as it were, symbolized the buoyant Egyptian. His face glowed with joy. No matter what: even in the face of the adversities which struck Egypt in such abundance under As-Sadat. What a love of life the Egyptians have! Although they have quite enough orginality too, in one thing they have always seemed to me to be the same. I have in mind their attitude to us, Soviets or, as they call us all, Russians. At the time that I was living in Egypt you did not need to know any language at all. No sooner did an Egyptian learn that a guest from Moscow was in front of him then his heart would swell, and all of it was meant for the guest.

How was it this time? As a matter of fact, exactly the same. Naturally, not all of those with whom I came to enter into dialogue argued in the same way. The bourgeois parasites on the whole kept quiet and the politicians close to them made out that there were no changes in Egypt. However, an overwhelming majority of Egyptians do want changes. I detected even a new feature. When speaking about all that was erected on the banks of the Nile with Soviet assistance, Egyptians make an interesting comment: No one has done so much good for us as the Russians. And most important of all — disinterestedly. These words came from the bottom of the heart. Of course, there were exceptions. But it was impossible not to hear this said.

An-Nasir Is Not Forgotten

At exactly the appointed hour a superbly turned-out attendant standing by the elevator on the third floor of the People's Assembly building conducted me to the office of Ibrahim Shukri, the Socialist Party leader. The opened doors closed noiselessly and I found myself in a huge office. Anxiety over the way our second conversation would go did not leave me as I crossed the space to the desk behind which the well-known politician, a gray-haired man with the air of a professor, sat.

In Egypt it is customary even on first meeting to inquire about people's health and general matters. It is a very kindly custom. Naturally, I did not fail to employ it. Then the ritual of polite mutual interest was over, and I finally determined to put my question.

"What does Egypt most lack today?"

"Changes for the better. That is precisely what every Egyptian thinks. The political climate for changes is favorable today. I should most likely talk about the stabilization of the economy, the necessity of wiping out corruption and strengthening democracy. These are two of the most important political fronts. But I should like to speak to you about something else. I am convinced that it is vitally necessary that we take account of the lessons of yet another Israeli war against the Arabs if we are to solve Egypt's most critical problems...."

I was not expecting such a turn in the conversation. Egypt had not participated in the resistance to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Last April Egyptians sincerely rejoiced in the return of the Sinai, but in June they were acutely aware of the high price that they paid for it.

"That war," I. Shukri continued, "convinced the Egyptians and all the Arabs that Israel does not want peace in the Near East. On the contrary, the policy of crushing the Arab countries one by one is becoming the basis of all its actions.

"Nor does the United States want peace in the region. At all events, it is permissible to ask: What was Reagan guided by when he supported Begin and Sharon? In Egypt now we perceive the true U.S. role in the terrible events in Lebanon as that of accomplice in the aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinians. The Israeli lobby in Washington is against Egypt. And now, as a result of the 'Lebanon shock,' Egyptians are looking at what is taking place in the Near East in a different way.

"I should now like to turn to the alterations in the political climate in Egypt, without which no kind of change for the better is possible. A new tendency in the development of the most important political events is gathering strength in the Arab countries. What I have in mind is the desire for mutual understanding with those who can help them to survive, principally, with the Soviet Union. In Cairo today the need to normalize Egyptian-Soviet relations is spoken of ever increasingly. I think it is more accurate to speak of a return of Egyptian-Soviet relations to their natural state. I am in favor of a broad Egyptian-Soviet partnership. In all spheres of cooperation. Chiefly, because such a character in our interstate relations will give to both sides a feeling of mutual need, and mutual benefit.

"I am in favor of the Soviet Union's participation in a comprehensive settlement in the Near East," I. Shukri continued. "After all, the present situation in the region, to put it plainly, is very unstable. Small steps toward peace when everyone is seeking only self-advantage will yield nothing. All the more so in that they cannot restrain an aggressive Israel. I am convinced that without the Soviet Union's participation there will be no stable and long-term peace in the Near East...."

Listening to I. Shukri, I could not help thinking about how far he reflected the mood in Egypt. Perhaps the words of my third interlocutor in Cairo are no more than an exception?

One further question. It concerned Egypt's relations with the United States. His reply was categorical:

"In Cairo it is customary to talk about a 'special relationship' between Egypt and the United States. I do not intend to determine how accurate this definition is. What I want to emphasize is that Egypt must not continue to oblige the United States at any cost merely because it received American economic and military aid."

I did not even begin to insist on the decipherment of such a complex notion as the Egyptian-U.S. "special relationship." I recalled what the selfsame Shukri had said about the new political tendency in Egypt and the Arab world. If that really has arisen, then it is scarcely accurate to perceive there relations as some sort of "absolute," completely stifling Egypt's national interests....

"What is the essence of your party's program?"

"We stand for the triumph of the principles of the July 1952 revolution."

"That is to say, An-Nasir is not forgotten in Egypt?"

"Far from it! Adherents to his principles are increasing in the country all the time, and what is more in all the Arab countries...."

Yet Another Nuance

A second meeting within the walls of the People's Assembly. On the sixth floor no less. This time I penetrated directly into the sphere of activity of the ruling National Democratic Party.

My interlocutor was Muhammad 'Abdallah, chairman of the parliamentary Foreign Affairs Commission. He is young, not forty yet. He spent more than a decade in Paris, where he taught and studied. M. 'Abdallah is a most striking representative of the so-called "new Egyptian intelligentsia," the generation of Egyptian politicians which is not, as it were, burdened by the weight of the past, and this includes the Egyptian revolution. Do you feel a difference between him and I. Shukri? Before the meeting with M. 'Abdallah my attention had been drawn to the fact that he had studied abroad and had not gone through the lecture halls of the American University in Cairo or the offices of branches of American foundations, like many representatives of the "new Egyptian intelligentsia."

M. 'Abdallah is in charge of the same office that Dr Fu'ad Muhyi ad-Din used to occupy before being appointed prime minister.

"Tell me, professor," I began our conversation, "how have the latest events in the Near East been reflected in Egypt's foreign policy?"

"More than impressively. Egypt has begun to realign its Arab and global policy. Thus, President Mubarak has blocked negotiations with Israel on the so-called 'administrative autonomy' for the Palestinian Arabs envisaged by the Camp David agreements. He did not go to Israel, primarily because it would have been necessary to visit occupied Jerusalem (east Jerusalem -- I.B.). Egypt recalled its ambassador from Tel Aviv as a mark of protest against the carnage in Sabra and Shatila (Palestinian camps in West Beirut -- I.B.). Finally, President Mubarak is asserting Egypt's territorial integrity and standing up for the return of Taba (a region in the Sinai Peninsula which in reality belongs to Egypt but which Israel considers disputable -- I.B.). Egypt is in favor of normalizing its relations with the Soviet Union. Although, I should like to emphasize particularly, not at the expense of relations with other great powers."

I understood this to be an allusion to the United States. I remarked to him that the maintenance of interstate relations was the sovereign matter of those countries concerned by them. Therefore it was scarcely logical to make relations with some countries dependent on the way that relations develop with others. Was that not so?

"That's right," M. 'Abdallah replied. "But in Cairo the feeling still predominates that it is necessary to emphasize the formulation of the question in such a way."

[Belyayev] "It seems to me that Egypt's relations with the United States should not be improved at the expense of the Soviet Union. The experience of Soviet-Egyptian relations in the past demonstrates that the Soviet Union has advocated and continues to advocate the Egyptians' resolving their foreign policy problems themselves."

"At present Egypt has friendly relations with the United States," M. 'Abdallah observed.

[Belyayev] "What is the connection between the first and second? By the way, can one really talk about any sort of 'friendship' between Arabs and Americans given the role that the United States is playing in Lebanon and throughout the Near East? Given that Reagan and Weinberger gave the 'green light' to yet another Israeli war against the Arabs, can one really call that friendship?"

['Abdallah] "I don't know about that. I think that by giving us aid the United States is conducting in its relations with Egypt a policy which cannot be called anything else. However, we should now like to realign Egypt's foreign policy. What do I have in mind? Principally, the normalization of relations between Egypt and the Soviet Union...."

For and Against Camp David

I had no difficulty in finding the waiting room of one of the ministries where the press center had sent me. I had been there more than once in the past. I had been received there by the well-known Egyptian politician, Vice President Mahmud Fawzi. He is the man responsible for the now-forgotten saying that "without Russia and its support a strong Egypt is impossible." He said it in 1971. M. Fawzi himself died some years later, but some people have not forgotten his words. I was taken through to one of the offices on the first floor. The man with whom I was to have the conversation smiled. Sincerely, but at the same time guardedly. He was probably worried, as I was, by the same question: What are we going to talk about?

The Egyptian began confidently. I could feel that he was convinced of his opinions. And behind it, perhaps, was not just the determination to see a Soviet journalist.

"With As-Sadat's departure a black page in Egypt's relations with the Soviet Union was turned."

It seemed as if we had unexpectedly changed places. Instead of asking, I was having to reply to this indirectly put question.

"It is possible, although my business is to comment on events. Now I should like to find out about the mood in Egypt. After all, so far as I can judge, the country is full of troubles."

"You're right! More than enough troubles. But one of the most important is to realign our foreign policy with the Arabs and within the Nonaligned Movement and to normalize relations with the Soviet Union."

So many new things had still not struck me in Cairo, although I had been in Egypt more than a week. It is interesting how others view such intentions. The vast U.S. Embassy building in Egypt quickly sprang to mind. That black slab of concrete and glass soars up into the sky. Hundreds of U.S. diplomats are working in the country. I then recalled a remark, and a justified one, too, by a very well-known Egyptian journalist: "The Americans are everywhere in Egypt, but they have not taken deep root. It did not work out."

Furthermore, Egyptian policy is a matter primarily for Egyptians! And if they now really want to realign their relations with the two great powers and are saying so openly, what is so surprising in that?

"We do not justify the harm that President as-Sadat caused to the Soviet Union," my official interlocutor continued. "But now, under President Mubarak, we could move toward one another, so as to open a new page in Egyptian-Soviet relations...."

The same thought again: Egyptian-Soviet relations must be normalized. That means that this is the general feeling in Egypt.

"We would like to restore our economic cooperation, to trade more with the Soviet Union and to revive cultural and scientific ties."

[Belyayev] "And Camp David?"

"For us it is a reality. Egypt has regained the Sinai occupied by Israel in 1976. But as for the present, we have already begun to formulate our return to the Arab ranks. But the Arab countries, as is well known, rejected Camp David and do not want to align with it...."

An interesting remark. In fact, Begin is now making war for Camp David. President Reagan also advocates the Camp David principles, even though he is also trying to hide them in his plan. A most unworthy attempt. You cannot talk seriously about the "Reagan plan" even though Egypt is championing that plan.

On the other hand, Begin and Sharon, who have rejected the "Reagan plan," are continually repeating that they will reoccupy Sinai should Mubarak deviate even slightly from the Israeli-Arab "peace" treaty. In the military sense, Egypt is now weaker than in 1973. Some of my interlocutors recognized that by supplying their country with a few weapons and depriving it of the most modern the United States is disarming the Egyptian Army.

Who Stole Peace From Whom?

I was previously acquainted with Mustafa K. Murad, a Liberal Socialist Party leader. In the intervening years he has become a more prominent political figure. In 1977 Murad flew with As-Sadat to occupied Jerusalem and set his seal on Camp David. In the conversation this time he stressed that he considered the "theft of peace" from Israel to be a great gain.

"Unfortunately," he continued, "as the Israeli war in Lebanon shows, Israel does not want peace. Begin and Sharon advocate permanent war in the Near East."

[Belyayev] "But after all, their policy is a direct continuation of Camp David."

[Murad] "Now Egypt needs a new policy. Yes, Egyptian-U.S. rapprochement exists. By no means out of love for one another. We simply believe that the United States can exert a stronger influence on Israel than anyone else in the modern world."

[Belyayev] "But the United States does not want to influence Israel."

[Murad] "That is why I advocate an improvement of relations between Egypt and the Soviet Union. Under the new president this has become feasible. Why should our countries not move toward each other? For example, Egypt and the Soviet Union could cooperate in everything connected with a Near East settlement in many spheres. I am not just talking about the restoration of Egyptian-Soviet economic cooperation and trade...."

I remember that Egypt had repaid promptly all the Soviet Union's economic and technical cooperation loans. For example, for the construction of such giants as the Aswan hydroelectric complex, the Helwan metallurgical combine and the Naja' Hammadi aluminum plant. And with interest.

"Let us do a deal on Egypt's military debts," Murad proposed. "Set an acceptable moratorium and we will settle the debts quickly. Why should Moscow and Cairo not give thought to this? This must be discussed now, right now. I advocate that the way to restoring Egyptian-Soviet relations be cleared as quickly as possible. On a mutually beneficial basis, of course."

I thought that much of what M.K. Murad said was interesting. With one reservation, it is true. He is still only the leader of an opposition party, and not of the ruling party, I put another question to him:

"Tell me, Mr Murad, how Egypt's national bourgeoisie intends to act under the new leadership?"

"They are still building up momentum. It was difficult for them under As-Sadat. And our bourgeoisie is waiting to see what the domestic policy of the new President Mubarak will be. Will he repeat President an-Nasir's radical reforms? That is what is holding them back."

"Does Egypt intend to review its stance on the quite critical issue of granting military bases on its territory to the United States?"

"The United States has no military bases in Egypt. These are merely facilities."

"Is there a difference between the former and the latter?"

"Judging by President Mubarak's decision to reduce Egypt's role in the joint U.S.-Egyptian maneuvers codenamed Bright Star last year, it would seem that there is...."

I left Cairo with the impression that Egyptians are really thirsting for change. Change for the better, of course. And for a normalization of Egyptian-Soviet relations. As my Cairo dialogues show, the need for such a move was indicated by people at different levels in the Egyptian political establishment. Those who profess patriotism stressed that the normalization of Egypt's relations with the Soviet Union would be in their country's national interests. Well, the immediate future will show the strength of the already apparent new trend in the development of Near East events which has been generated by yet another Israeli war against the Arabs in Lebanon. An Egyptian-Soviet dialogue in the conditions now taking shape on the banks of the Nile could continue.

PEACE & PROGRESS COMMENTS ON CORRUPTION IN EGYPT

LD041008 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1630 GMT 3 Feb 83

[Commentary by Sabir al-Masri in Egyptian vernacular]

[Text] Good evening compatriots. Last week I spoke to you about the subject of corruption. This week I am going to speak to you about the same subject because the matter is serious and we must talk about it with the utmost frankness.

The story brothers is that this week's magazines and newspapers, radio and television are all busy with the Ismat as-Sadat story. There is much talk and the story is now a very big one. Some say that As-Sadat was the cause; others say that he was innocent; others write and say that the economic open-door policy is basically responsible for all this. But where does the truth lie? The truth is as the poet said: Make me forget all words such as hungry, weary, rags, toiling; make me forget the merchants that suck the blood of dreams, and the gangs that steal from the life of the people and the sweetest days of life. Yes, God, make me forget, forget everything; forget that Rashad Osman, as you know, after all that has been said about him, has been released from prison by the socialist prosecutor himself who made an about-face when Rashad Osman was reconciled with him and paid him a few piasters. This age is definitely cursed? As the proverb says: I listen to what you say and believe you; I look into your matters and you pay me!

We have heard about Rashad Osman from the socialist prosecutor, and also about the war against corruption, and we have believed: We are right to be surprised when we see Rashad Osman, so they talk about Ismat as-Sadat. The socialist prosecutor says in the three newspapers and all the magazines: He is qualified with a certificate of primary education; he started life as a bus conductor in Tanta in 1944; he was also a trader. In 1973 he was sentenced in six cases for issuing false checks; before that he was accused in 1966 of falsifications while working for the bus company in the east of the Delta. But his real work started in business in 1974. Be very careful about this date, in the words of the socialist prosecutor. Do you know why? This date is the beginning of the implementation of the economic open-door policy of his brother As-Sadat.

The socialist prosecutor continues: Since 1974 he worked for an agency and speculated, selling false import authorizations as well as land and buildings that were not his property by means of false contracts. He imposed taxes on businessmen in return for his facilitating for them the continuation of their businesses and projects. He won many tenders through crooked ways. Crooked -- it's a nice word isn't it! Naturally all this talk has not (?angered anyone). The base of the game in the agency business in the country is in the hands of the agents of multinationals.

Furthermore, the socialist prosecutor says of him, he imported together with (Tawfiq 'Abd al-Hay) 2,500 tons of frozen meat, which he distributed for consumption without a certificate confirming that it was fit for human consumption. He also imported rotten sauce. Oh yes, of course: We are going to eat his rotten meat without its sauce! One of his consignments was discovered by chance in 1978. This obliged the former president to put him in jail for 2 months; then he was released without trial, and resumed his activity. (?Where was the former president); his brother was killing people with their own money, by poisoning, and he is given just 2 months in jail. He did not have the meat and sauce confiscated; no not at all; we have of course eaten the meat and the sauce.

Ismat as-Sadat was released, and tried to work in the arms business with America through the transporting of arms consignments sold to Egypt. He put pressure on the defense minister and some officials in the Army, to the extent that he even resorted to attacks in the media against some officials; where? In the American newspapers themselves!

But as the accusation says, he failed in this. Naturally he was bound to fail, because you know of course who had the monopoly of the arms business. Come on Uncle Ismat: Content yourself with meat, sauce, and sponging and leave arms to the big guys. He who is 1 day older than you has 1 year's knowledge more than you; and he is not just 1 day older than you, he is 8 years older than you, and his position allows him. Twenty one stocktaking committees were set up to assess the properties and wealth of Ismat as-Sadat. Their activity covered various parts of the republic, various parts of the republic. Not even King Faruq at his time, lads, (?had such property), but at least that would have been because he was king.

What matters is that the committees say about the wealth: Ismat as-Sadat possesses 7 maritime companies, a maritime agency, enterprises and trade, 3 flats, 3 villas, 3 chalets in Al-Ma'murah, some land in Alexandria and Sidi (Srir), 2 factories, 8 shops, and a farm for [words indistinct], a car depot containing 20 trucks in Mit Abu Al-Kawm, 2 apartment blocks in Cairo, and a large palace in Al Ma'adi with 54 rooms; the socialist prosecutor affirmed that Ismat as-Sadat obtained this for his daughter by a false contract. The report says that the palace has a swimming pool and sports courts; a swimming pool too, and sports courts. The socialist prosecutor then says that this is all that the committees have found so far. [Words indistinct] in addition to a maritime transport company in the name of his Greek wife, consisting of 17 boats and ships, Ismat as-Sadat, defending himself says: This is not only my property, it is the property of a large family composed of 4 wives and 15 sons and daughters. Oh yes, he is in hardship. With these simple and modest resources at his disposal, at a time of hard living conditions and soaring prices that we all know so well, how can he feed and nourish such a large family.

Clearly too his brother As-Sadat was not helping him, because his widow lady (Jihan) said that she would not allow Ismat into her home. What could the man do then, tear himself up? He is obliged to feed his family. The truth is that Lady (Jihan) is not to be envied too. They have begun to talk about the thousands of millions she has, which she affirms is not hers but the property of Wafa and Amal [a charity she presides over], collected as donations for Egyptians abroad and for businessmen. Indeed investigation has now begun with her brother (Safwat Ra'uf) for embezzlement to the detriment of the people, misuse of power and corruption.

The socialist prosecutor says about him that he too began life as a simple clerk with the Eastern Tobacco Company with a 60 pound salary, and now he has thousands of millions. The poor man; It does not matter; neither you Ismat is the cause, nor is it you sir (Safwat). You are just clothes racks on which the parasite class hangs its scandals. You are (?this year's) scapegoat, the victim of the open-door policy. As for us however, we are the victims of you all.

ZAMBIAN, UN LEADERS ON NAMIBIA, OTHER ISSUES

LD022040 Moscow TASS in English 1958 GMT 2 Feb 83

[Text] Lusaka February 2 TASS -- Official talks began here today between Zambia's President Kenneth Kaunda and the U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar.

Before the start of the talks, Kenneth Kaunda made a statement noting that Resolution 435 of the U.N. Security Council constitutes the only basis for resolving the problem of Namibia. Zambia, the president said, condemns the Reagan administration's attempts to link the question of granting independence to Namibia with the presence of Cuban troops in Angola. This approach, he said, has been the cause of the continuing killing of people, and destruction of material values, not only in Namibia and Angola, but also in Zambia and other countries.

The president denounced the West's hypocritical position with respect to the racist regime of South Africa. The appeals by Western states to exercise tolerance are no longer acceptable, he said. The West views the question of human rights in South Africa only from the angle of its enormous vested interests in that country. Kenneth Kaunda pointed out that despite the cruel exploitation of the Africans, the West continues to invest heavily in the economy of South Africa.

Recently the world was witness to the victories won by the peoples in Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Soon this will happen in Namibia, Kenneth Kaunda said.

With reference to the situation in the Middle East, the president said that a long-term solution to the problems of the region cannot be found without accomodating the rights of the Palestinian people.

The U.N. secretary general praised Zambia's support for the U.N. initiatives.

Perez de Cuellar said that the apartheid is destroying the unity of nations. He stressed that the Namibian problem must be settled in keeping with the U.N. plan on the basis of Resolution 435. There can be no alternative to a peaceful settlement of the question, he said.

Independent African states have been victims of aggressions from the South African regime and its attempts to destabilise the situation in those countries. An end must be put to this, Perez de Cuellar stressed.

The U.N. secretary general expressed his support for a broader economic cooperation between African states.

CIA SEEN BEHIND 'SUBVERSION' AGAINST GHANA

PM021443 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Feb 83 p 3

[TASS report: "Hatching a Plot"]

[Text] Accra, 1 Feb -- According to information received here, armed formations are massing near Ghana's borders, on the territory of a number of neighboring states, especially the Ivory Coast. Their purpose is to support antigovernment forces in Ghana plotting the overthrow of the Provisional National Defense Council (PNDC). As part of this campaign, in an attempt to exploit ethnic conflicts, internal reaction has been provoking disturbances among the country's population. Combat groups are being moved in to coordinate operations between external forces and the underground inside Ghana.

Faced with the growing threat of imperialist intervention, the Ghanaian authorities are taking steps to safeguard national security. Garrisons have been strengthened in border towns.

A curfew still operates in the capital. The Armed Forces have been placed on alert.

The CIA has sharply increased its subversive activities in Ghana, the people's DAILY GRAPHIC newspaper writes. The U.S. agents' main aim, the newspaper stresses, is to subordinate the country's policy to Washington's global interests.

The CIA, the people's DAILY GRAPHIC writes, supplies anyone willing to stage an anti-government rebellion with weapons, ammunition and money. Early in 1983 in Lagos the Nigerian police arrested a group of former Ghanaian servicemen on whom U.S. weapons, ammunition and money given them by CIA agents were found. Fearing further exposures, many Ghanaian counterrevolutionaries, the newspaper points out, moved from Lagos to London and then to the Ivory Coast and Togo, from where they have engaged in subversion against Ghana.

The counterrevolutionaries' aims, the newspaper stresses, are to sow dissension among tribes in Ghana and to split the PNDC ranks. The CIA, which fears Ghana's pursuit of a policy of progressive social and economic transformations, is behind this subversion.

Additional Reportage

LD042140 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English to Africa 1500 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Excerpts] The United States Central Intelligence Agency is stepping up its subversive activities against Ghana. The people of the country have drawn attention to the intensified brainwashing of certain representatives of the Ghanian Army and a number of civil servants by the employees of American establishments in Accra. Observers consider in connection with this that, in spite of the fact that the Armed Forces of the country tried to carry out a state coup last year, the Central Intelligence Agency is not giving up its attempts to once again persuade the reactionary forces to topple the progressive regime of Jerry Rawlings and to place the country under American dictate.

It is well known that the main efforts of American imperialism are directed at intensifying international tension, undermining the camp of socialism and liquidating progressive governments in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Washington gives the Central Intelligence Agency the leading role in carrying out these strategic designs since the central agency [as heard] has to its account hundreds of criminal operations against sovereign states, political and public figures and national liberation movements. It is also well known that the Central Intelligence Agency plays a criminal role in Washington's subversive, terroristic strategy in Africa.

It is indicative that the former Presidents of the United States preferred as a rule to say nothing about the covert actions of the CIA and Reagan, on the contrary, is coming to the defense of this establishment. He is portraying the CIA men as heroes and the eyes and ears of the free world. And it is precisely the Reagan administration that has lifted all restrictions that were imposed on the CIA's activities by previous American Governments. For example, the ban on subversive actions against Angola has been lifted. In so doing, the American Administration is wilfully taking upon itself the role of an accomplice and participant of international terrorism. As we can see, the secret subversive operations of American intelligence have become a real part of the arsenal of means with the aid of which Washington is trying to obtain its imperialistic goals in Africa.

According to the American magazine MINORITY OF ONE what the CIA is guilty of is particularly repulsive. The immorality of that agency involves it in such affairs that only a sick mind could imagine. There is nothing so mean that these people would stop at.

MEETING MARKS ANNIVERSARY OF GHANAIAN-USSR TIES

PM041507 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jan 83 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent F. Tarasov: "Notable Date"]

[Text] Accra, 18 Jan -- A ceremonial public session has been held here to mark the 25th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Ghana. Ghana was the first country of Black Africa to win independence and to establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

The eminent public figures and Ghanaian specialists educated in the USSR who addressed the meeting spoke of the great part which the Soviet Union played in liberating Africa from the colonial yoke.

D. Elliott, the first Ghanaian ambassador to the Soviet Union, said that the establishment of diplomatic relations with the USSR was a major milestone in Ghana's history. In the first socialist power the African peoples found a loyal friend in their struggle for the assertion of national independence, against the racist regime in South Africa and for the economic development of all countries of the continent.

CUBAN CP MEMBER IN ETHIOPIA FOR COPWE TALKS

LD031705 Moscow TASS in English 0924 GMT 3 Feb 83

[Text] Addis Ababa February 3 TASS -- Cuba is in the first ranks of the champions of peace, freedom and equality on earth, it can serve as an inspiring example for all developing countries that have chosen the road of socialism, said Berhanu Baye, member of the Standing Committee of the Provisional Military Administrative Council and of the Executive Committee of the Commission for Organizing the Party of the Working People of Ethiopia. He had taken part in talks with Montane Oropesa, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, visiting in Ethiopia.

They discussed a wide range of questions related to the further devleopment of bilateral contacts and also to the international situation.

Berhanu Baye spoke highly of the consistent position of the Cuban people on the Ethiopian revolution, who rendered and continue rendering it all-round assistance and support on the principles of proletarian internationalism. Montane Oropesa in turn exposed the militaristic aggressive course of the United States and its allies who persistently try to aggravate tension in various regions of the world, especially in Africa and Latin America. In face of this criminal collusion the strengthening of the common anti-imperialist front acquires particular significance, he said, and pointed to the full identity of the views of Cuba and Ethiopia in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN EL SALVADOR ASSESSED

'Interventionist Schemes' Revealed

LD040001 Moscow TASS in English 1104 GMT 3 Feb 83

[Text] Managua February 3 TASS - A big contingent of American Marines has been moved to El Salvador on the plea of protecting United States citizens in that country, the NOTISAL agency reports.

At the same time, the agency adds, United States Ambassador Deane Hinton urged the ringleaders of the Salvadoran military to see to it that the army units that are fighting the insurgents in Morazan Department hold out if only till February fifth. In the opinion of political observers, the agency says, the actions of the United States diplomatic mission in San Salvador and also the military exercises in Honduras, launched by the Pentagon, are evidence showing that the Reagan administration begins implementing its interventionist schemes designed to suppress the insurgent movement which recently has embraced a vast part of Salvadorean territory.

Vietnam Parallels Drawn

LD061318 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0130 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] The Salvadoran NOTISAL agency has reported that a large contingent of U.S. Marines has been transferred to El Salvador on the pretext of protecting U.S. citizens in the country. This fresh militaristic action by Washington is undoubtedly fraught with the most serious consequences, notes international affairs journalist Aleksandr Baryshev, both for the situation in El Salvador and for that in the whole of the explosive region of Central America. It is evidence that the United States has decided on an escalation of its interference in Salvadoran affairs which borders on direct armed intervention.

One cannot help recalling the events in Vietnam. As is known, once it got bogged down in the quagmire of the dirty war against the Vietnamese people, Washington went along the road from economic support for the rotten Saigon regime to direct involvement of U.S. troops in combat actions. It seems that the White House is now moving along the same inglorious road in El Salvador as well. The fact that the United States has begun preparing for an evacuation of its civilians from El Salvador also shows that the Pentagon intends to involve itself even more deeply in the Salvadoran civil war on the side of the reactionary regime in order to suppress the rebel movement. U.S. economic and military aid for the ruling Slavadoran clique is growing year by year. The country is flooded with U.S. instructors and advisers. They have, in effect, become an integral part of El Salvador's Armed Forces. They command punitive troops and participate directly in their operations. And now regular units of the U.S. Marines have been brought into the country. By all accounts, a fresh page is being opened in the history of bloody intervention by the U.S. military in the countries to the south of the Rio Grande.

'Adviser' Injured, Officers Withdrawn

LD060800 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 6 Feb 83

[Text] Washington February 6 TASS -- A scandal in the U.S. over the injury of a U.S. "adviser" in El Slavador during combat operations has annoyed the Pentagon. Dissatisfied with the fact that the participation of American servicemen punitive operation against patriots has become an open secret, the U.S. Defense Department relieved of their posts two U.S. officers and a sargeant Saturday, who were "guilty" of that occurrence so unpleasant to Washington.

At the same time it became known that the injured U.S. "adviser" served in a punitive detachment of "Green Berets" who gained bad reputation for their atrocities during the war in Vietnam. It is these cutthroats who teach Salvadoran military the "scorched earth" tactics and directly control combat operations. According to the weekly U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, U.S. servicemen are at the head of the Salvadoran Army.

U.S. ACCUSED OF BIOLOGICAL WAR AGAINST CUBA

LD031418 Moscow TASS in English 1312 GMT 3 Feb 83

[Text] Moscow February 3 TASS -- The USA does not cease its biological, chemical and bacteriological war against Cuba, which causes civilian casualties and inflicts serious damage upon the economy of the freedom island. The book "Secret War Against Cuba" by Soviet journalist Fyodor Sergeyev issued by Moscow's "Progress" Publishers cites numerous facts of subversive activities by the USA. It tells, in particular, a story about the CIA's sabotage -- the smuggling and spreading in the island of the African Pig Fever virus, which caused a mass cattle-plague. To stop the cattle-plague it was necessary to kill 500 thousand pigs. In the opinion of U.N. experts, that outbreak of Pig Fever epidemics was "the most dangerous and alarming accident" in agriculture in 1971.

The CIA also spread in Cuba the virus which caused Dengue Fever involving losses of human life.

The book also says that the USA has more than once artificially modified weather. The American Airforce sprayed over Cuba's territory chemical substances, which once caused showers, once droughty weather with the aim of destroying sugar cane crop.

As a result serious damage has been caused to the cattle, large farming areas have been poisoned. It is absolutely clear that by lifting all restrictions on the CIA's activities and prohibiting exposure and official investigation into the CIA's clandestine operations, President Reagan has turned this espionage department into one of the basic tools of the aggressive imperialist policy of the USA, the author says.

ARKHIPOV RECEIVES CUBA'S RODRIGUEZ, CAPOTE

PM041333 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Feb 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talks Held]

[Text] On 1 February I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received C.R. Rodriguez, vice president of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba, and had talks with him.

R.A. Capote, Cuban ambassador to the USSR, participated in the talks.

CASTRO REPLIES TO USSR CONGRATULATIONS

LD042044 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Fidel Castro Ruz, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, chairman of the State Council and Council of Ministers of the Republic, has sent a telegram to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidum and Council of Ministers, in which he expressed deep gratitude for the fraternal congratulations on the occasion of the 24th anniversary of the victory of the Cuban revolution. The telegram expresses confidence that the Soviet Union will continue the untiring struggle for peace. We hope that 1983 will be a year of new successes for the Communist Party, the government and the people of the fraternal land of the soviets, the telegram says.

SHEVARDNADZE ADDRESSES TBILISI PARTY AKTIV

LD052231 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 5 Feb 83

[Text] An integrated program for stepping up the struggle against violations of the law was adopted today in Tbilisi at a meeting of the party aktiv of Georgia. Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, and other speakers noted that the struggle for public order and discipline is being carried out on a wide front in the republic. A whole complex of organizational, law-enforcement and ideological measures is being coordinated and directed by a working group of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee. A similar group is operational in city and rayon party committees.

Analyzing the state of affairs in the struggle against crime, the participants in the meeting noted that its results should be more tangible. Critical remarks were made and concrete proposals put forward aimed at the further strengthening of party, state and labor discipline.

DEMICHEV, SHAURO ATTEND CULTURAL SOIREE

LD042326 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Excerpts] A literary soiree devoted to the 70th anniversary of the birth of the Ukrainian poet Andrey Malyshko was held in Moscow today in the Hall of Columns of the House of Unions. Present at the soiree were Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of culture; Comrade Shauro, head of the Culture Department of the CPSU Central Committee; and people active in literature and art from Moscow and the union republics.

USSR CITIZENS CITED ON OVERSEAS VISITS

PM041403 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian on 23 January carries on page 3 a 2,400-word article entitled "Back Home" by correspondent L. Sotnik, who writes from Lvov. Sotnik cites the comments of six named Soviet citizens from surrounding oblasts who have recently visited relatives who now live in various Western countries, including the United States, Canada and Britain. The Soviet citizens stress the fears of unemployment, crime, high prices and rents which they found among their overseas relatives and which Sotnik contrasts with the Western image of Soviet life, which forms part of general Western "anti-Soviet propaganda."

IZVESTIYA VIEWS WASTED, SUBSTANDARD BREAD

PM031133 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 21 January in the Morning Edition publishes on page 3 a 2,200-word article by V. Sukhachevskiy under the heading "Bread to the Table; Why Does This Very Important Food Frequently Go to Waste or To Feed Livestock?" Although bread no longer occupies a central place in the Soviet diet, that is no excuse for its frequently poor quality, Sukhachevskiy states, going on to report that 2 percent of the bread produced at USSR Ministry of the Food Industry enterprises is rejected as substandard. Current standards for bread are unsuitable, so that "while maintaining production volumes at the planned level we sometimes produce knowingly defective output which is thrown away." Sukhachevskiy also claims that the production of a greater number of small loaves would help to reduce waste and notes the need to improve flour storage and transportation facilities. Finally he notes that "there are not and cannot be" objective reasons for bread shortages in some areas. It is essential, Sukhachevskiy concludes, to enhance the prestige of the baker's profession and to attract young people to it.

COSMOS-1439 EARTH SATELLITE LAUNCHED 6 FEB

LD070843 Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 7 Feb 83

[Text] Moscow February 7 TASS -- Artificial earth satellite Cosmos-1439 was launched in the Soviet Union on Sunday. On board the satellite is installed scientific equipment designed to continue outer space exploration.

The satellite was launched into an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution -- 89.7 minutes; maximum distance from the earth's surface -- 371 kilometres; minimum distance from the earth's surface -- 180 kilometres; inclination of the orbit -- 70.4 degrees.

On board the satellite is installed a radiosystem for accurate measurement of orbit elements; radio telemetric system for transmitting back to earth data about the operation of instruments and scientific equipment.

The equipment installed on board the satellite is functioning normally. The coordination-computer centre is processing the incoming information.

SPACE MISSION PLANNED TO STUDY COMET, VENUS

LD042110 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 4 Feb 83

[Text] Moscow February 4 TASS -- TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova writes:

Soviet scientists have plans to study Galilea comet which revolves around the sun with a period of 75-76 years. Last time it was observed was in 1910. The comet is expected to be seen from earth again in 1986. Scientists have plans to use this opportunity to send spacecraft to the comet.

Models of instruments that will be installed on a Soviet interplanetary station to be sent to the comet have already been manufactured.

The station will comprise two craft, landing and fly-by. Before the approach to Venus it will split up.

The landing craft will head for Venus while the fly-by one will continue on its flight to meet Galilea comet. According to the estimates the craft will fly close to the comet head at a distance of ten thousand kilometres. The aim of the craft is to study the nucleus of the comet, and its environment, to determine the composition and state of the comet's matter.

The bright Galilea comet attracted the attention of scientists since time immemorial; man first observed it in the year 446 B.C. After that the comet was watched 29 times more.

Taking part in the implementation of the project for the studies of Galilea comet together with Soviet scientists will be specialists of Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, France, Austria, the FRG.